THE ANATOMY OF THE MASS.

Wherein is ſhewed by the *Holy Scriptures*, and by the Teſtimony of the Ancient CHURCH, that the *Maſs* is contrary to the Word of GOD, and far from the Way of Salvation.

By *PETER du MOULIN.*

And tranſlated into *Engliſh*,
By *JAMES MOUNTAINE.*

Together, with a learned
TREATISE of TRADITIONS.
Tranſlated by *G. C.*

DUBLIN:
Printed for WILLIAM BRIEN, Bookſeller in *Dame-Street*. MDCCL.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Imprimatur.

Tho. Wykes, R. P. *Epiſc.*
Lond. Capell. Domeſt.

To the Right Honourable and moſt Illuſtrious LORDS:

The Earl *The*

of { Bedford. / Hartford. / Eſſex. / Warwick. } *Viſcount* { Say *and* Seale. / Savile. } *Lord* { Wharton. / Brooke. }

Right Honourable,

GOD having been pleaſed not to ſuffer my heart to be much enamoured with worldly preferments and imploys of that nature, whereby I have poſſeſſed my ſoul in quietneſs and enjoyed more liberty: In acknowledgment of that favour, and being perſwaded withal that God hath not weaned me from theſe pleaſures for to ſit ſtill and to be idle: My chief ſtudy hath been, according to my poor ability, to buſy my mind, and to apply my heart, to ſpiritual things, which might both better my ſelf and others, and make me (if not ſo rich and ſo conſiderable in this life, yet (I am ſure) through God's free mercy, rich and eminent enough in the life to come. Wherefore, in the proſecution of that holy reſolution, after ſeveral Works of this nature which by God's providence I have given to the publick in the *French* tongue, and which (I may ſay it truly and without vanity) have not been without fruit: It hath pleaſed the ſame divine Wiſdom to put into my heart, to give unto this Pious Nation, this little Work in their own language. And for as much as your Honours are of the eminenteſt of the Kingdom, and of the maineſt and principal Pillars, which, under your moſt Pious and moſt Gracious Sovereign, uphold both this Church and Common-wealth: And furthermore, ſeeing alſo that all the eyes of this flouriſhing Nation (grounded upon that aſſured knowledge it hath

of your fervent Love to GOD, Loyalty to your PRINCE, and tender affection to your Country) are now fixed upon you as upon ſo many *Moſeſes* ſtanding in the gap between them and God's threatning judgments: I have thought my ſelf bound in duty (having ſo fair an opportunity as this is) to crowd among the reſt into your preſence, and to ſhew as well as others, this publick and true teſtimony of my moſt humble reſpects, in preſenting firſt with all humility this poor labour of mine unto your Honours, jointly: Being unwilling (ſo long as I find divers precedents of the like Dedications) to divide and ſeparate thoſe whom GOD and the KING have joined together: Beſeeching you to accept of it; to vouchſafe it your Patronage, and to bear in its forefront your Honourable Names. I preſume that for the Author his ſake, your Honours will not deny me that favour. And the rather, becauſe it tends to the ſame end that ye aim at, to wit, God's Glory, and the furtherance of true Religion. For, Moſt Illuſtrious Lords, I have been an eye witneſs above this eighteen years, of that conſtant Zeal and Exemplary Piety which is ſo reſplendent in your Honours. And oftentimes being raviſhed in admiration to ſee ſuch extraordinary gifts and graces in ſuch great Perſons, notwithſtanding the corruption of the times; I have bleſſed God heartily for it, and prayed his Divine Majeſty to pour more and more upon your Lordſhips, the dew of his heavenly graces unto the end. And indeed, Right Honourable, to conclude this in a word, I can atteſt upon my own knowledge of that eighteen years ſtanding; That although your Honours do live here among men, your converſation hath been for the moſt part with God; neglecting no means (for all your great and weighty occaſions) to wait and attend upon his ſervice, in his holy Courts and Sanctuaries. But alas, all that I can ſay in that behalf, is but as a drop of water thrown into the vaſt Ocean. And therefore, Right Honourable, I muſt crave leave to ſay no more; and aſk pardon that I have ſaid ſo little, and ſo far ſhort of what your Honours deſerve.

As

As for the Author and Work, I ſhould ſay ſomething too, if he and his Works were not better known than I can expreſs. Yet I will ſay this by the way; that he hath been, is, (and long may he be) one of the worthieſt and moſt powerful Inſtruments in God's hand for the converſion of Souls, deſtruction of *Babel*, and rearing up of *Bethel*, that this Age hath afforded. And for this particular Work of his, it ſhall ſuffice me to ſay (to give it the higheſt commendation I can) that it is *Peter du Moulins*'s.

Finally, Right Honourable, I ſhould ſay ſomething alſo touching my ſelf: Which ſhall be only to beſeech again your Lordſhips to be pleaſed to pardon the boldneſs of a poor ſtranger, in Dedicating this ſmall book, and firſt fruits of his (that have ſeen the light in the Engliſh tongue) unto your Honours; excuſe the defects that may be found in the ſame, (though I hope you ſhall find it faithfully tranſlated, and free from any groſs barbariſms in the Language:) And to attribute that exceſs of temerity, to the exceſs of the honour I bear unto your Lordſhips; for whom I ſhall never ceaſe to call upon God for an encreaſe of Honour and long Proſperity here on Earth, until that being full of days, and having finiſhed your courſe in his fear, ye receive that Crown of Glory which is laid up for you in Heaven.

And ſo, fearing to be too tedious and troubleſome unto your Honours: I humbly take my leave and reſt,

Moſt Renowned Lords,

Your moſt humble and moſt

devoted ſervant.

JAMES MOUNTAINE.

A TABLE of the CHAPTERS.

FIRST BOOK.

Chap. I. *THE Inſtitution of the holy Supper, by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as it is contained in the firſt Epiſtle of the Apoſtle Saint* Paul *to the* Corinthians. Chapter 1. Page 1.

Chap. II. *Four and thirty contrarieties between the holy Supper and the Maſs. And how far the Church of* Rome *is departed from the inſtitution of the Lord.* page 12

Chap. III. *How the change in the Lord's Inſtitution, hath changed the nature of the Sacrament. And that in the Maſs there is no conſecration.* 14

Chap. IV. *That by altering the Lord's Inſtitution, the* Roman *Church hath changed the nature of Chriſt.* 15

Chap. V. *Of* Maldonat *his audaciouſneſs in giving Saint* Paul *and Saint* Luke *the lie: and in correcting Saint* Matthew *and* Mark: *And of the fruit of the Vine.* 17

Chap. VI. *How much Chriſt is diſhonoured by this Doctrine. And of the character indelible: And of the power of creating ones Creator.* 20

Chap. VII. *That the very words of the Maſs are contrary to Tranſubſtantiation.* 24

Chap. VIII. *Recrimination of our Adverſaries.* 25

Chap. IX. *Cauſes why the Pope admitteth not of any alteration in the Maſs, and will not conform himſelf to the Lord's Inſtitution.* 26

Chap. X. *Places wherein the Doctors and Councils of the* Roman *Church maintain, that the Pope and the Church of* Rome *are not ſubject to the Scripture, and have greater authority than the Scripture, and may make void and aboliſh the Commandments of God.* 27

Chap. XI. *That our Expoſition of theſe words,* This is my body, *is conformable to the Scripture and to the nature of Sacraments, and approved by the ancient Fathers, and confirmed by our Adverſaries.* 33

Chap. XII. *That our adverſaries, to avoid a clear and natural figure, forge a multitude of harſh and unuſual*

ones,

ones, and ſpeak but in figurative terms. And of Berengarius *his confeſſion.* Page 37

Chap. XIII. *Of the Aſcenſion of the Lord, and of his abſence; and of that our Adverſaries ſay, that in the Sacrament he is Sacramentally preſent.* 40

Chap. XIV. *Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, acknowledging that Tranſubſtantiation is not grounded in the Scriptures. That the Primitive Church did conſecrate by the Prayer, and not by theſe words,* This is my Body. 44

Chap. XV. *Of the adoration of the Sacrament. The opinion of the* Roman *Church.* 48

Chap. XVI. *Examen of the Adoration of our Sacrament by the word of God. That the ancient Chriſtians did not worſhip the Sacrament.* 52

Chap. XVII. *Of the Prieſt's intention, without which the* Roman *Church believeth no conſecration, nor Tranſubſtantiation is made.* 56

Chap. XVIII. *That our Adverſaries, in this matter, entangle themſelves into abſurdities and inſoluble contradictions.* 61

Chap. XIX. *Of accidents without a ſubject. Places of Fathers.* 68

Chap. XX. *Anſwers to ſome examples brought out of the Scriptures by our Adverſaries for to prove that the body of Chriſt hath been ſometimes in two ſeveral places.* 72

Chap. XXI. *Of the dignity of Prieſts. And that our Adverſaries debaſe and vilify the utility and efficacy of Maſſes, and make them unprofitable for the remiſſion of ſins. And of the traffick of Maſſes.* 74

Chap. XXII. *That the* Roman *Religion is a new Religion, and forged for the Pope's profit and of the Clergies.* 81

Chap. XXIII. *Anſwer to the Queſtion made unto us by our Adverſaries, where was your Religion before* Calvin. 86

Chap. XXIV. *That our Adverſaries do reject the Fathers, and ſpeak of them with contempt.* 94

Chap.

Chap. XXV. *Of the corruption and falsification of the Fathers Works, and of the difficulty to understand them.* Page 99

Chap. XXVI. *Places of the Fathers, contrary to Transubstantiation, and to the manducation of the body of Christ by the corporal mouth.* 102

Chap. XXVII. *Confirmation of the same, by the custom of the antient Church.* 118

Chap. XXVIII. *Explanation of the places of the Fathers, that say that in the Eucharist we eat the body and blood of Christ, and that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and is made Christ's body. Specially of* Ambrose, Hillary, *and* Chrysostom. *That the Fathers do speak of several kinds of body and blood of Christ.* 119

Chap. XXIX. *That divers antient Fathers have believed a mystical Union of the Godhead of Christ with the bread of the Sacrament.* 128

Chap. XXX. *Particular opinion of St.* Austin, *and of* Fulgentius, *and of* Innocent *the third.* 137

Chap. XXXI. *That the Church of* Rome *condemning the Impanation, is fallen herself into an error a thousand times more pernicious, by Transubstantiation. And of the Adoration of the accidents of the bread.* 138

Chap. XXXII. *That the Sacrifice of the Mass, was not instituted by Christ. Confession of our Adversaries.* 140

Chap. XXXIII. *That the Sacrifice of the Mass agrees neither with Scripture nor with reason.* 142

Chap. XXXIV. *In what sense the Holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice. Of* Melchisedeck's *Sacrifice. And of the Oblation whereof* Malachy *speaketh.* 146

Chap. XXXV. *In what sense the Fathers have called the Eucharist a Sacrifice.* 148

The Second BOOK.

Of the MANDUCATION of the Body of CHRIST.

Chap. I. *OF two sorts of Manducation of Christ's Flesh, to wit, the spiritual and corporal: and which is the best.* 152

Chap.

The TABLE.

Chap. II. *That in the sixth of Saint* John, *the Lord speaks not of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, nor of the manducation of his flesh by the mouth of the body.* Page 156.

Chap. III. *That the* Roman *Church by this Doctrine depriveth the People of Salvation.* 161

Chap. IV. *That the principal Doctors of the* Roman *Church, yea the Popes themselves, do agree with us in this Point: and hold that in the sixth of Saint* John *nothing is spoken but of the spiritual manducation; and that those that contradict them, do speak with incertitude.* 164

Chap. V. *Reasons of our Adversaries for to prove that in the sixth Chapter of Saint* John *it is spoken of the Manducation by the Mouth of the Body.* 167

Chap. VI. *Testimonies of the Fathers.* 170

Chap. VII. *Impiety of* Salmeron *the Jesuit, and of* Peter Charron. *And of* Bellarmin's *four Men inclosed in one suit of Cloaths. That by this Doctrine, Christ hath not a true Body in the Sacrament.* 175

Chap. VIII. *Of the progress of this abuse, and by what means Satan hath established the Transubstantiation.* 178

Chap. IX. *Of the judgment which the Doctors of the Roman Church do make touching the apparitions, whereby a little Child, or a morsel of flesh hath appeared at the Mass in the Hands of the Priest, and touching Christ's blood that is kept in Reliques.* 186

Chap. X. *Of the corruption of the Papal See in the Ages wherein this errour was most advanced.* 189

Chap. XI. *Of the oppression of England. How Religion passed out of England into Bohemia. Of* Wicklif. *Of* John Huz, *and of* Hierom *of Prague. Of the Council of* Constance. *Of* Zisca *and* Procopius, *and of their Victories.* 193

Chap. XII. *The Confession of* Cyril *Patriarch of* Constantinople, *now living, touching the Sacrament of the Eucharist.* 204

Cyprian in his Sixty-third Epiſtle to *Cæcilius*, Section 7. ſpeaking of the Euchariſtical Cup.

The Holy Apoſtle teacheth that we muſt no manner of way ſwerve or depart from that which is commanded us in the Goſpel, and that the Diſciples ought to practiſe and do the ſame things which the Maſter hath done and taught.

And in the Eleventh Section.

If Chriſt muſt be heard alone, we ought not to regard what others before us have thought fitting to be done, but what Chriſt, who is before all, hath done firſt. For we muſt not follow the cuſtom of man but the will of God.

The Commentary upon the firſt to the *Corinth.* attributed to Saint *Ambroſe* in the Eleventh Chapter.

The Apoſtle ſaith That that man is unworthy of the Lord, which celebrates this myſtery otherwiſe than it was celebrated by him. For that man cannot be devout, which preſumes to do otherwiſe than it was given us by the Author.

THE

SUBSCRIBERS

TO THE

ANATOMY of the MASS.

A

HENRY Allcock, Esq;
William Acton, Esq;
Anthony Adams, Esq;
Revd. John Thomas Atkins, A. M.
Mr. Abraham Ardesoif, Attorney
Mr. Maskeline Allcock, Attorney
Mr. Maskeline Allcock
Mr. James Allen
Mr. William Andrews
Mr. Thomas Attkison.

B

Hon. Brinsly Butler, Esq;
Revd. Dr. Baldwin, P. T. C. D.
Henry Baldwin, Esq;
Henry Baldwin, the Younger, Esq;
Henry Baldwin, the Youngest, Esq;
Reverend Dr. Alexander Bradford
Reverend Mr. William Brook, A. M.
William Buckley, Esq;
Hon. Charles Beauclere, Esq;
John Becher, Esq;
Henry Bond, Esq;
Reverend Thomas Breviter, D. D.
Reverend Robert Berkley, D. D.
Reverend Robert Brereton, A. M.
Reverend Stephen Bootle, A. M.

Henry Cole Bowen, Eſq; 10 Books
Thomas Boyſe, Eſq;
Richard Bourke, Eſq;
Mrs. Elizabeth Baldwin
Mr. Richard Brown
Mr. Robert Bonham, Attorney
Mr. John Brett
Mr. George Bruce
Mr. William Butler
Mr. James Bredin
Mr. Patrick Boyd
Mr. Thomas Baker, Attorney
Mr. John Burcheſs, Attorney
Mr. Francis Booker
Mr. William Bell
Mr. Henry Beevan
Captain George Brereton
Mrs. Alice Brereton
Miſs Suſannah Beaumont
Mr. John Baron
Mr. Arthur Baſtable
Mr. William Braddock
Reverend Jones Burcheſs

C

Right Reverend Lord Biſhop of Cork and Roſs
Captain John Catillon
Captain David Cugley
Alexis Collins, Eſq;
Richard Chadwick, Eſq;
Robert Carew, Eſq;
Shapland Carew, Eſq;
Reverend Thomas Cooper, A. M.
Reverend Marmaduke Cox, A. M.
Reverend Mr. James Cottingham
Mr. Moſes Collins, A. B. T. C. D.
Reverend George Chinnery, Junior, A. M.
Mr. Edward Curtis
Mrs. Cunningham
Mr. Thomas Cox

Mrs. Ellen Crofts
Mr. John Church
Mr. John Collis
Mr. Edward Chetham.

D

William Deane, Eſq;
William Deſpard, Eſq;
Henry Dering, Eſq;
James Dexter, Eſq;
Jonathan Darby, Eſq;
John Dillon, Eſq;
Reverend William Denniſton, 7 Books
Reverend William Darby, A. M.
Reverend Richard Daniel, A. M.
Reverend Mr. John Drury
Reverend Mr. Diſney
Mr. Donnaldſon, Attorney
Mr. Francis Daxon, Attorney
Mr. Andrew Dobbyn
Mr. Daniel Dalton
Mr. Iſaac Dickinſon
Mr. William Donnaldſon
Mr. Charles Darragh
Mr. Robert Downes
Mr. Ralph Dore.

E

Chriſtopher Earberry, Eſq;
Richard Eyere, Eſq;
James Ellard, Eſq;
Reverend John Euſtice, A. M.
Reverend Mr. William Ellis.

F

James French, Eſq;
Michael French, Eſq;

Santry Francis, Eſq;
Mr. James Flack, Attorney
Mr. William Fenner, Attorney
Mr. Richard Fenner, the Younger, Attorney
Reverend Richard Farmer, A. M.
Captain Francis Ford
Reverend David Freeman, A. M.
Reverend James Fetherſton, A. M.
Mrs. Penelope French
Mr. Timothy Fitz Gerald
Mrs. Mary French
Mr. William Freeman
Mr. Zacharias Foxhall
Mr. John Ferguſon, Merchant
Miſs Jane Freeman
Mr. Robert Fulton, A. M.
Mrs. Frazer
Mr. Jones Fawſon
John Farell, M. D.
Mr. Charles Farran, Attorney
Mr. Andrew Fanklyn
Mr. John Fitzſimons.

G

Robert Grove, Eſq; 6 Books
Joſeph Gaſcoigne, Eſq;
Standiſh Graydy, of Elltown, Eſq;
Mr. Herbert Gillman
Reverend Mr. Thomas Goodwin
Miſs Heſter Goff
Mr. Andwew Goodwin
Mr. Simon Gotier
Mr. Thomas Gillaſpy
Reverend Francis Gouldſbury, A. M.
Mr. William Gibbins
Mr. John Grove
Mr. Grove
Miſs Catherine Grove
Mr. Bartholomew Gibbins
Mr. John Garſtin.

Right

H

Right Hon. Lord Viſcount Hillſborough
Reverend Samuel Hales, A. M.
Reverend Robert Hort, A. M. Archdeacon of Ardagh
Reverend Michael Heatly, A. M.
Joſiah Hort, Eſq; F. C. T. C. D.
John Hort, Eſq; F. C. T. C. D.
Mr. Samuel Heydon, A. M.
Mr. Love Hiatt
Mr. Edward Haughton
Mr. Edward Hill
Mrs. Harriſon
Miſs Hutchinſon
Mr. Joſeph Haddock
Richard Hopkins, L. L. B.
Mr. Samuel Hobart
Robert Houſton, M. D.
Mr. Thomas Harriſon
Mr. William Hodgings
Richard Hungerford, of the Iſland, Eſq;
Thomas Hungerford, Eſq;
Godfrey Hemſworth, Eſq;
Miſs Hanchet
Miſs Clements Hamilton
Mr. William Hickey, Attorney
Mr. Thomas Hoope
Mr. Bejamin Harper, Merchant
Mr. Samuel Holmes
Mr. Thomas Harris
Mr. Richard Hinde, Attorney
Mrs. Hamilton.

I

Anthony Jephſon, Eſq;
John Irwin, Eſq;
John Jones, Eſq;
Mr. Edward Jones.

Mr. Thomas Iſaac
Mr. George Julian
Mr. Charles Jones
Reverend Mr. Andrew Irvine
Francis Jones, Eſq;
Mr. Humphry Jones
Mr. Robert Jephſon
Mr. William Johnſton, of Johnſtown
Mr. John Irwin.

K

Right Hon. Earl of Kildare,
Reverend Andrew King, A. M.
Howard Kyan, Eſq;
Reverend Edward Kippax, A. M. 6 Books.
Reverend Mr. James Kyan
Mr. John Kyan
Mrs. Kelly
Mr. Peter Killkelly, Attorney
Mr. Adam Kyan, Attorney
Mr. William Kingſmell

L.

Wlliam Lingen, Eſq;
Reverend Daniel Letablere, D. D.
Reverend Rickard Lloyd, A. M.
Mrs. ——— Leybourne
Mr. Lawrence Lawrenſon
Mr. Robert Leland
Mr. John Lodge
Mr. William Langſton
Mr. Gabriel Lloyd
Mr. Alexander De. Lanauza
Mr. George Lanauze
Mr. Joſhua Leathley
Mr. Thomas Lucas, A. B. T. C. D.
Mr. William Lloyd
Mr. James Lane
Arthur Lyſaght, Eſq;
Mr. John Lloyd

Reverend

Reverend George Lewis, A. M.
Mr. Thomas Lane
Mr. John Lyon

M.

Emanuel Moore, Eſq;
Samuel Moore, Eſq;
George Moore, Eſq;
John Mercer of Virginia, Eſq;
Captain James Mercer, Lord Torrington's Regiment
Mrs. Anne Moore
Reverend Fowke Moore
Reverend Robert Meade, A. M.
Mr. Andrew Maziere
Mr. Michael Mitchel, Attorney
Mr. Robert Moore
Mr. Richard Moore
Mr. James Morton
Mr. Richard Marſh
Mr. James Moore
Mr. Thomas Mullock
Mr. Joſeph Medlicot
Francis Mc. Manus, Eſq;
Mr. William Mc. Grath, Attorney
Reverend Allen Morgan, A. M.
Mr. Ruby Mc. Carty
Reverend Thomas Meulh, A. M.
Reverend William Mockler, A. M.
Mrs. Jane Myars
Mr. Lawrence Mc. Namara
Mrs. Minchin

N.

Carncroſs Niſbitt, Eſq;
John Niſbitt, Eſq;
Mr. James Newton, Merchant
Reverend Mr. Andrew Nixon
Mr. Charles Nobileau, Merchant
Mr. William Nelſon
Mr. Arthur Norcot

Mr.

Mr. James Nelſon
Mr. John Naſon

O

Honourable James O'Bryen, Eſq;
O'Donovan
George Ormſby, Eſq;
Mr. Samuel Owens Attorney
Mr. Walley Oulton, Merchant
Mr. Charles Oulton, Merchant
Philip Oliver, Eſq;
Mr. Dennis O'Callaghan

P

Reverend John Pellifier, D. D. Vice Provoſt of T. C. D.
Emanuel Pigot, Eſq;
Oneſiphorus Phaire, Eſq;
Howard Parry, Eſq;
Reverend John Powell, A. M.
Reverend Joſhua Phipps
Reverend Michael Phillpot, A. M.
William Parſons Eſq; F. C. T. C. D.
Reverend John Palliſer, A. M,
Reverend Charles Palliſer, A. M. 3 Books
Reverend Adam Perry, D. D.
Mrs. Elizabeth Proſſor
Mr. James Pedder
Reverend Mr. Price
John Preſton, Eſq; Junr.
Mr. John Pilkington, Attorney
Mr. John Pallen
Mr. Henry Palmer, Attorney
Mr. Andrew Peace

R

Hercules Langford Rowley, Eſq;
John Rye, Eſq;
Doctor Roſs
Mr. Francis Ryan

Mr.

Mr. John Reilly
Mr. George Reynolds, Merchant
Mr. William Richmond
Edward Richardſon, Eſq;
Mr. Watkins Roberts
Mr. Michael Roberts
William Roſeingrave, Eſq;
Mr. Joſeph Rayner, Mercer
Mr. John Rorke, Attorney
Mr. John Rourke, Merchant
Reverend Moſes Rouguies, A. M.
Mr. Daniel Riordane
Mr. Francis Roche, Serv.
Miſs Rynd

S

Honourable and Reverend John Skeffington, A. M.
John Shephard, Eſq;
Mr. Richard Steele
Mr. Robert Shimmin
Mr. Thomas Salkield
Reverend Joſhua Story, A. M. Archdeacon of Kilmore
Mr. James Splain
Mr. James Splain, Junr.
Mr. William Sampſon
Lewis Selleries, Eſq;
Bedell Howard Standford, Eſq;
Edward Scriven, Eſq;
Mr. Daniel Swiny
Mr. Ralph Sneyd, Mercer
Mrs. Elizabeth Salmon
Mr. Chriſtopher Standring
Joſeph Sproule, Eſq;
James Sproule Eſq;
Mr. William Sproule, Attorney
Mr. Edward Spencer, 6 Books
Mrs. Shephard
Mr. Jonathan Sciſſon
Mr. Edward Sneyd
Mr. Francis Smyth, Jeweller

Mr.

Mr. Edward Seymore, T. C. D.
Reverend Arthur Sayers, A. M.
Hugh Swayen, Eſq;
Matthew Sankey, Eſq;
Mr. Thomas Spires

T

Reverend Thomas Tuckey, A. M. 6 Books
Robert Travers, Eſq;
Richard Townſend, Eſq;
Philip Townſend, Eſq;
Reverend Horatio Townſend, A. M.
Mr. Richard Terry, Attorney
Mr. Joſeph Thwaits
Reverend William Trench, A. M.
John Tuite, Eſq;
Reverend John Travers, A. M.
Mr. Nathaniel Trumbal
Mr. Richard Turner
Mr. Samuel Townſend T. C. D.

V

Reverend William Vowell, A. M.
Mr. William Villiers, Attorney
Mr. Peter Vidouſe, Merchant
Mr. Joſeph Verſcoile

W

Right Honourable Earl of Wigton
Mr. Thomas Weekes, Regiſter of Cork
Mr. Henry Wrixon, of Ballygibblin
Mrs. Winthrop
Mr. Thomas Weekes, Attorney
Mr. Edward Weekes, T. C. D.
Mr. James Weekes, T. C. D.
Mr. Thomas Wilſon
Mr. Luke Wall
Mr. Richard Wetherall

Mr.

Mr. John Woodman
Mr. John Ware
Robert Warren, Eſq;
William Warren, Eſq;
Mr. John Weekes, Attorney
Charles Walker, Eſq;
John Wallace, Eſq;
Mr. Henry Wallace, Attorney
Reverend Samuel Whaley, A. M.
Mr. John Willmott
Mr. William Walker, Attorney
Mr. George Walſh
Mr. Edwin Windis
Mr. Thomas Wetherelt
Richard Warren, Eſq;
Mr. Henry Wayland, Attorney
Reverend Peter Whyte
Mr. Weſton Watkins
Mr. Robert Wrixon, of Kilrow
Mr. Robert Wrixonof Corke
Mr. Henry Wrixon of Bloſſoms-Fort

Y

Mr. William Young, Attorney
Mr. James Young, Attorney

THE ANATOMY OF THE MASS.

BOOK the FIRST.

CHAP. I.

THE Inſtitution of the holy ſupper by Chriſt Jeſus, as it is contained in the firſt epiſtle of the apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the *Corinthians* Chap. 11.

23. *I have received of the Lord that which alſo I delivered unto you; that the Lord Jeſus the ſame night in which he was betrayed, took bread:*

24. *And when he had given thanks, he brake it and ſaid, Take, eat: This is my Body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.*

25. *After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood: This do ye as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me.*

26. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come.*

27. *Wherefore, whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*

28. *Let a Man therefore examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.*

29. *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's body.*

Saint *Matthew* in the 26th Chap. and 29th Verſe, adds theſe Words of the Lord.

BUT I ſay unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom.

And in the 27th Verſe he teſtifieth that Chriſt preſenting the Cup to his Diſciples, ſaid, *Drink ye all of it.*

CHAP. II. *Four and thirty contrarieties between the Lord's holy Supper and the Maſs; and how far the Church of* Rome *is departed from the Inſtitution of the Lord.*

NONE can deny but that our Lord Jeſus did inſtitute the holy Supper aright and as it ought: And it were an Impiety to find Fault with his Inſtitution. Therefore the ſhorteſt way, yea the only means to end all our Differences, would be to come back to Chriſt's Inſtitution, and to ſpeak as he ſpoke, and to do as he did. That is the thing which we deſire and beg with ſo much earneſtneſs, and whereunto the Church of *Rome* can by no means agree. For the Council of *Trent* in the XXII Seſſion, denounces *Anathema* on all thoſe that ſhall ſay that in the Canon of the Maſs there is any error. Yet nevertheleſs it is evident, that the Maſs is nothing elſe but a changing and a disfiguring of the Lord's Inſtitution. Whereof we will give ſome Examples.

1. Chriſt inſtituting the holy Supper among his Diſciples, ſpoke in a known and intelligible Tongue to the Aſſiſtants. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the Maſs ſpeaketh in a Tongue which the People underſtand not.

2. Chriſt preſenting the Cup to his Diſciples, ſaid, *Drink ye all of it.* And St. *Paul* in the 1ſt to the Cor. Chap. 11. Verſe 28. bids the People of *Corinth* to drink of the Cup, ſaying, *Let a Man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.*

Cup. And in the 10. Chap. 17. Verſe, *We are all partakers of one Bread, and one Cup:* according to the Verſion of the Roman Church, ſolely authoriſed by the Council of *Trent*.

3. Chriſt in celebrating the Euchariſt, ſpoke not of ſacrificing his body, and made no offering unto God his Father. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the Maſs pretends to ſacrifice, Chriſt's body, and offereth him up to God in ſacrifice propitiatory for the quick and for the dead, without a warrant, and without God's command.

4. Chriſt in the holy Supper made no elevation of the hoſt, as likewiſe the Apoſtle worſhipped not the Sacrament, but ſat ſtill at the table. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the Maſs lifts up the hoſt, and maketh the people to worſhip it.

5. Chriſt did not cauſe any bones nor reliques of Saints to be put under the ſacred table, and did not aſk of God the remiſſion of ſins through the merits of thoſe Saints whoſe reliques were under the table. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the Maſs, kiſſing the Altar, ſpeaks thus to God, † *We pray thee, Lord, through the merits of thy Saints, whoſe reliques are here, that thou wilt vouchſafe to pardon me all my ſins.*

6. Chriſt ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Take, eat*. On the contrary, in the Roman Church, a great number of private Maſſes are ſaid, at the intention of ſuch as pay for them, without communicants and without aſſiſtants, in which the Prieſt ſaith, *Take, eat:* but there is no body either for to take or for to eat. Yea even in publick Maſſes, the Prieſt oftentimes eateth and drinketh alone.

7. Three Evangeliſts, *viz*. S. *Matth*. in the 26 Chapter, S. *Mark* in the 14 Chapter, and S. *Luke* in the 22. and S. *Paul* in the 11th Chapter of the firſt to the *Corinthians*, teſtify that Chriſt gave Bread to his Diſciples, ſaying, *He took Bread, and brake it, and gave it*. Now the Sacrament is not given but after the conſecration. Chriſt therefore gave bread after the con-

† Oramus te, Domine, per merita Sanctorum tuorum, quorum reliquiæ hic ſunt, & omnium Sanctorum; ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea.

ſecration. And St. *Paul*, 1 to the *Corinth*. Chap. 11. Verſe 26, 27, and 28, ſaith three ſeveral times that *we eat bread*. And in the 10th, Chapter, Verſe 16, he ſaith that *we break bread*. And in the 20th Chapter of the *Acts*, Verſe 7, it is ſaid that *the Diſciples came together to break bread*. On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* teacheth, that in the Euchariſt no bread is eaten, and that the Bread is not broken; but that which the Prieſt breaks in the Maſs, is the body of Chriſt, which nevertheleſs cannot be broken.

8. Chriſt giving that Bread, ſaid, *This is my body*, declaring that the bread that he gave, was his Body. On the contrary, the Roman Church teacheth that the bread is not the Body of Chriſt: But that the bread is no more bread, and that it is tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's Body. Now how the bread is Chriſt's Body, himſelf teaches it, when he adds that it is his Commemoration. Even as in the next line following he ſaith that *the Cup is the New Teſtament*, becauſe it is the Sign and Commemoration of it; according to the ſtile of the Scripture that giveth to the Signs and Memorials the name of the thing which they do ſignify and repreſent.

9. Chriſt called that which was in the Cup *the fruit of the Vine*, ſaying *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine*. On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* teacheth that that which is in the Cup is not the fruit of the Vine, but blood. And ſaith, that in the Cup is not only the very blood of Chriſt, but alſo that his Body, and his Soul and his Divinity is there; and that the Body is whole in every drop of the Chalice. Whereupon it followeth (and the Roman Church believes it ſo) that Chriſt drank his fleſh, and ſwallowed down his own Soul and Body, and eat himſelf, and had his head in his mouth.

10. The Evangeliſts do record that Chriſt having taken bread, bleſſed it. But according to the Church of *Rome*'s Doctrine, which aboliſheth the ſubſtance of the bread in the Euchariſt, Chriſt did not bleſs the bread; for, to deſtroy a thing and reduce it to nought, is not to bleſs it.

11. Chriſt

11. Chriſt diſtributing the bread and breaking it, ſpoke in the preſent tenſe, ſaying, * *This is my body which is broken for you.* Whereby it appeareth that by his body he meant the Sacrament or Commemoration of his Body. For Chriſt's natural body cannot be broken. To ſhun the force of this argument, the Latin Verſion of the Roman Church hath corrupted this place, and inſtead of theſe words, *Which is broken for you*, § hath turned *Which ſhall be delivered for you*, putting *delivering* for *breaking*, and the future for the preſent. And indeed our adverſaries are mightily peſtered to tell us what it is that the Prieſt breaketh in the Maſs. Doth he break Bread? But they ſay that it is no more Bread. Doth he break Chriſt's Body? But it cannot be broken, and they themſelves ſay that it is whole and entire in the leaſt crum of the hoſt, as big and as large as it was upon the Croſs. Doth he break the Accidents of Bread which moſt fraudulouſly they call *ſpecies*, *viz.* the taſte, the colour, and roundneſs of the Hoſt? But theſe things cannot be broken. Can a man make pieces of taſte, or of whiteneſs? None but bodies can be broken.

12. The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* conforming himſelf to the *Lord's* inſtitution, ſaith in the 10 Chapter of the 1ſt to the *Corinthians*, 16 Verſe, that *the Bread which we break, is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt.* The Church of *Rome* gainſays and contradicts every word of this ſentence. The Apoſtle ſaith that it is Bread. The Church of *Rome* on the contrary ſaith that it is not Bread. The Apoſtle ſaith that it is Bread which we break. On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* ſaith, that it is fleſh which we do not break. The Apoſtle ſaith that this Bread is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt. On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* ſaith, that this Bread is Chriſt's Body itſelf. Behold then a clear and a plain expoſition of theſe words, *This is my body:* given by the Apoſtle, to wit, *The Bread which I break, is the communion of my Body,*

---

*Κλώμενον quod frangitur. § 1. Cor. 11. 14. Quod pro nobis tradetur.

and not that which the Church of *Rome* giveth, *viz. That which is under these* ſpecies, *is tranſubſtantiated into my Body.*

13. It is very conſiderable that the ſame Apoſtle, in the ſame Chapter and 21 Verſe, makes an oppoſition between the Lord's Table and the Table of Devils, ſaying, *Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table and of the Table of Devils.* The reaſon of the oppoſition ſhews plainly, that as to be partaker of the Table of Devils, is not to eat Devils, but to be partaker of the Meat conſecrated to Devils. So to be partaker of Chriſt's Table, is not to eat Chriſt, but to be partaker of the Meat conſecrated by Chriſt, in Remembrance of Chriſt and of his Death.

14. Chriſt in diſtributing the Bread and the Cup, ſaid, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* Theſe words ſhew manifeſtly that the Prieſt makes not Chriſt in the Maſs, and ſacrifices him not. For it is impoſſible to make Chriſt in Remembrance of Chriſt. It is impoſſible to ſacrifice Chriſt in Remembrance of Chriſt. Can a man build a houſe in Remembrance of that houſe? Did *Aaron* ſacrifice a Lamb in Remembrance of that Lamb? Beſides that the Remembrance is but of things abſent and paſt, as Saint *Auſtin* ſaith upon the 37 Pſalm, *Nemo recordatur niſi quod in præſentia non eſt poſitum: No remembrance can be had but of things that are not preſent.* The council of *Trent* declareth indeed that Chriſt by theſe Words, *Do this,* commanded that he ſhould be ſacrificed in the Maſs: But beſides that Chriſt cannot be ſacrificed in Remembrance of Chriſt, the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* preſently after theſe words, *Do this in Remembrance of me,* addeth the explication, ſaying, *For as often as ye eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come.* Will we therefore know what is to *Do this?* Saint *Paul* teacheth us that it is to eat of this Bread and drink of this Cup, for to ſhew and declare the Remembrance of Chriſt his Death.

15. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt broke the Bread before he pronounced the words which they call the words of Conſecration. *He took the Bread, and bleſſed it, and broke it,*

it, and gave it, saying, *This is my Body which is broken for you.* Whereby it followeth by the doctrine of the *Roman* Church, that he broke bread unconsecrated and untransubstantiated. On the contrary, in the *Roman* Church the Priest breaks the host after the words of Consecration; to the end the People may believe that he breaks and sacrifices the very body of Christ. Our adversaries then confess that the Priest breaks another thing than Christ broke.

Some, for to arm themselves against the Apostle, which saith that *the Bread which we brake, is the Communion of the body of Christ*, tell us that St. *Paul* saith that we break Bread, because that when he did Minister his holy Sacrament, he did break before he consecrated, following Christ's example, and consequently did break unconsecrated bread. But those that speak so, contradict the *Roman* Church, which doth not believe that the fraction of the unconsecrated bread, is the Communion of the body of Christ.

16. The same Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. saith, *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat* OF *this Bread:* Which is the same kind of Speech used by Christ, saying *Bibite ex eo omnes,* * *Drink ye all of it.* The Apostle commands us to *eat* OF *this Bread*; that is to say, to take every one his part and portion of it: And Christ saying *Drink ye all of it*, bids the Communicants to take their share of the Cup. This manner of speaking is become absurd in the *Roman* Church, who by this bread, understand Christ himself. For they would esteem that man to be mad, or a mocker, that should say that we eat every one his portion of Christ's body.

17. Christ presenting the Cup to his Disciples, said in the present Tense that it was his Blood which is shed for many. Where manifestly he speaketh of a Sacramental, and not of a real Effusion. For our Adversaries confess that in the Mass the blood of Christ is not shed out of the Body, and goeth not out of the Veins. He therefore speaks of a Sacramental effusion, which is

* Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

reſpective to the real effuſion made upon the Croſs. We aſk then, whether the Prieſt in the Maſs drinketh that blood of Chriſt which came out of his Side and Wounds upon the Croſs. If they anſwer that the Prieſt drinks not that blood of the Lord which iſſued forth of his body upon the Croſs, but that blood which remained in the body, and is there ſtill; thereby they confeſs that the Prieſt drinks not the ſame blood which Chriſt will have us to drink. For he commands us expreſly to drink the Blood ſhed for us. But if they Anſwer, that the Prieſt drinks the ſame Blood which the Lord ſhed upon the Croſs, then they preſuppoſe raſhly, and without the word of God, that that blood which came out of the Lord's body, is gotten in again. All this abuſe comes for lack of conſidering that in the holy Supper, Chriſt's body is repreſented unto us, and preſented to our faith, as ſuffering, and broken, and dying, and dead for us, and his Blood as ſhed and iſſued out of his Body. Whereas on the contrary, the *Roman* Church hath a conceit, that ſhe receives the ſpiritual and glorious body of Chriſt, and his blood encloſed within the Body and within the Veins.

18. The Apoſtle St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. And St. *Luke* Chap. 22. record that Chriſt ſaid, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood.* If by this word of Cup the blood muſt be underſtood, the ſenſe of theſe words ſhall be, *This blood is the New Teſtament in my blood.* By that means, lo here, two kinds of blood of Chriſt, whereof the one ſhall be within the other.

19. Chriſt in celebrating the holy Supper, ſaid, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* And St. *Paul* hath told us here above, that in eating this bread we ſhew his death. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the Maſs ſaith, that he celebrateth, *In the firſt place*, the remembrance of the Virgin *Mary*; ſaying, *Communicantes & memoriam venerantes in primis glorioſæ ſemperque Virginis Mariæ: Communicating and ſolemnizing in the firſt place the remembrance of the glorious Virgin Mary*, leaving Chriſt behind. As *Gabriel Biell* ſaith in the 32d Leſſon of the Canon of the Maſs, *Firſt and principally the remembrance is made of the moſt bleſſed Virgin Mary, becauſe*

cauſe (ſaith he) *ſhe is the moſt ſafe ſanctuary of our calamities, and hath been the adminiſtratrix and diſpenſatrix of this Sacrifice, and all the reaſon of our hope.*

20. In the whole inſtitution of the Euchariſt, there is no mention made of the Saints, neither is there any command to pray unto Saints: No word of the interceſſion of Angels. On the contrary, the Prieſt in the *Confiteor* of the Maſs, prays *Michael* the Archangel, and *John* the Baptiſt, and all the Saints to pray for him. There are ſome Maſſes in which the Litany is rehearſed, which is but a long chain of Prayers unto Saints. In the Maſs, they bleſs the Incenſe through the interceſſion of *Michael* the Archangel. The Prieſt aſks of God, that he would be pleaſed to command his Angel to take the conſecrated Hoſt, and to carry it up to Heaven. And for an exceſs of abuſes, at the offertory of the Maſs, the Prieſt ſays he makes that oblation in honour of the Virgin *Mary* and of the Saints; as if the holy Supper were inſtituted in honour of the Creatures. That, truly, is to put the Creatures above Chriſt. As when a Man gives Alms in God's honour, he preſuppoſes that God is more excellent than the alm.

21. St. *John* in the 13th Chapter, and 27th Verſe, witneſſeth, that in the action of the holy ſupper, the Devil entered into *Judas*. But our adverſaries, with moſt of the Fathers, hold, that *Judas* was partaker of the Euchariſt, with the reſt of the Diſciples. They will therefore that both Chriſt and the Devil have entered together into *Judas*. So they give unto Chriſt a very unſuitable Companion; and truly, the Son of God, and the Devil, had been very ill lodged together.

22. We agree in this point with our Adverſaries, that Chriſt eat and drank with his Diſciples, and was partaker of the holy Sacrament. He ſheweth it himſelf ſufficiently, when after he had delivered the Cup he ſaid, *I will Drink no more of this fruit of the Vine.* Whereby it followeth, that after the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, Chriſt did eat himſelf, and ſwallowed his own Body and Soul, and had his whole Body in his Mouth, and in his Stomach. By this means Chriſt's paſſible Body, devoured the impaſſible Body. Where-

upon it were good to know, what Chriſt's Body did within the body of Chriſt, and how Chriſt's Soul could enter into Chriſt's Body, ſeeing that it was in already. And ſince that, that which contains, and that which is contained, are ſeveral things, and that nothing contains it ſelf: By this Doctrine it is evident that they make Chriſt to have two Bodies, the one of which was contained within the other. And ſince that to eat ones ſelf, is a more Admirable thing than the Creation of the World, it is not credible that Chriſt did eat himſelf without ſome great profit ſhould come thereby for our Salvation. Yet our Adverſaries produce none at all.

For to prop ſo extravagant a Doctrine, and which expoſes the Chriſtian Religion to laughter, our adverſaries alledge a place out of St. *Auſtin* upon the 33 Pſal. where he ſays, that in this Sacrament, Chriſt did carry himſelf in his own hands: But *Auſtin* ſays not only that he did carry himſelf in his own Hands, but he ſaith, *Ipſe ſe portabat quodam modo cum diceret, Hoc eſt Corpus meum; he did carry himſelf in a manner when he ſaid, This is my Body.* So a Man that carries his own Picture in his Hands, carries himſelf in a manner even as it would be a ſenſeleſs Speech to ſay that the Moon is the Moon in a manner: ſo if that which Chriſt carried in his Hands, was his true Body, it would be a fooliſh thing to ſay that it was his Body in ſome kind. For concerning the ſenſe of theſe words, *This is my Body*, St. *Auſtin* expounds them plainly enough in the xii. Chapter againſt *Adimantus*, ſaying. *The Lord made no difficulty to ſay, This is my Body, when he gave the ſign of his Body.*

23 Chriſt our Lord was ſitting at the Table, his Face turn'd towards the Aſſiſtants. Whereas the Prieſt, in the Maſs, ſtandeth before an Altar, turning his Tail to the People.

24 Chriſt gave to every one of the Aſſiſtants, a piece of the Bread he had broken with his Hands, which Bread his Diſciples received with their own hands. As alſo in the ancient Church both Men and Women received with their Hands the Sacrament under both kinds: The contrary of all that is practiſed

in

in the Maſs, in which the Prieſt chops into the Mouths of the Communicants a round Wafer unbroken. If a woman had touched with her hand, I do not ſay the hoſt, but only the Cloths, or the Patin, or the Chalice, that would be thought a heinous offence, and a profanation of ſacred things.

25 Our Lord Jeſus inſtituted this Sacrament for the remiſſion of Sins, and for to ſhew his Death. * But in the *Roman* Church they ſing Maſſes for the eaſing of ſick People, for preſerving of the Vines from a white Froſt, for the healing of a Horſe, &c. In all theſe the Prieſt makes a gain. For that man at whoſe intention the Maſs is ſaid, is to pay for it.

26 The Apoſtle St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* xi. 12. called this Sacrament, the Lord's Supper, whereof we find but of one ſort. But the *Roman* Church hath invented a thouſand ſorts of Maſſes. There is the Maſs of the *Holy Ghoſt*. The Maſs of St. *Giles*. That of *Linus* Pope. That of St. *Francis*, &c. There are amongſt other Maſſes, that of St. *Catherine*, and that of St. *Margaret*, which are Saints that never were in the World, no more than St. *Urſula*, St. *Longis*, St. *Chriſtopher*, and many others, which they have placed in Heaven, though they were never upon Earth. Item, there are *Loud* Maſſes, and *Low* Maſſes, *Great* Maſſes and *Small* Maſſes, *Day* Maſſes, *Epiſcopal* Maſſes, in *White*, and others in *Green*, and others in *Violet* Colour.

27. Chriſt in the holy Supper made no Prayer for the Dead. On the contrary, there is in the Maſs a Prayer for the Dead, by which the Prieſt prays for the deceaſed which ſleep in the Sleep of Peace. † A thing which is to be carefully obſerved. For it ſhews that when this Prayer was added to the Maſs, they did not then believe the Purgatory. For thoſe that burn for many Ages in a hot burning Furnace, ſleep not Peaceably.

---

* Mat. 26, 28. 1 Cor. 11. 16. † Qui dormiunt in ſomno pacis.

28. *Item*,

28. *Item*, the confeſſion which the Prieſt makes at the Maſs, in the *Confiteor*, is very far from the Lord's inſtitution. For in it the Prieſt confeſſes his Sins unto God, and to the Virgin *Mary*, and to *John* the Baptiſt, and to *Peter* and *Paul*, and to all the Saints: None is there left out but Chriſt.

29. In the Maſs of the Friday before Eaſter, they worſhip the Image of the Croſs with the higheſt adoration, called by them *Latria*, which is due to God alone, ſaying, *Behold the Wood of the Croſs, come let us Worſhip*. There likewiſe is ſung the *Anthem* which ſaith, *We do worſhip thy Croſs, O Lord*. And ſpeaking to the Croſs, *Faithful Croſs, the only noble among the Trees, &c.* That is to ſpeak to a ſenſeleſs thing, and which underſtands not.

30. Upon the Altar there be Images, as alſo in all places of the Churches, that are commanded to be worſhipped, under the penalty of a Curſe, by the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, which they term the eighth general Council, and by many *Popes*, and generally taught by the *Jeſuits*.

31. Chriſt celebrated the holy Supper with all Simplicity. But the Prieſts of the *Roman* Church, ſing Maſſes with allegorical Habits, and full of Myſteries, with a thouſand turns, and indecent geſticulations, unbeſeeming the Holineſs of that Action. They buſy the Eyes of the People, becauſe their Ears are of no uſe to them.

32. In the Canon of the Maſs there is an evident untruth. For the Prieſt ſaith, that the Lord when he had taken the Chalice into his Hands, ſaid, *This is the Chalice of my Blood of the New and Eternal Teſtament, Myſtery of the Faith*, contrary to the teſtimony of the Evangeliſts, in which theſe words are not to be found. Pope *Innocent* in the Chapter *Cum Marthæ de celebratione Miſſarum*, ſaith, that the Church holds that from the Tradition. Which he will have Men to believe, though it be contrary to the Goſpel.

33. All that Chriſt ſaid, in celebrating this Sacrament, he pronounced it with a loud and intelligible voice; he did not mutter in Secret the Words which

are

are called the Words of conſecration, as the now *Roman* Church doth, which in this point, as in many others, differs from the Greek and Eaſtern Churches, which pronounce the Words of Conſecration with a loud Voice. The Pope *Innocent* the third, in the third Book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, Chapter firſt; and *Durant* in the fourth Book of his *Rationals*, Chap. xxxv, renders the reaſon of this change; to wit, that one day it came to paſs that certain Shepherds having learned the Words of Conſecration, pronounced them upon the Bread of their ordinary Meal, which was inſtantly turned into Fleſh; wherewith God being angry, ſent down Fire from Heaven that conſumed them. Nevertheleſs, they vary in the recital of this Fable, and do not tell where, and when that came to paſs, neither do they bring any witneſs nor do agree one with another in the relation of that ſtory.

34. After that the Diſciples of the Lord had taken the Sacrament, Chriſt did not command that the remainder of the Bread ſhould be lock'd up in a Box, and kept for to be carried in Pomp up and down the Streets, as the *Roman* Church doth on *Corpus Chriſti* day, and in its *Octaves*. This holy Day was inſtituted by Pope *Urbanus* the Fourth, § in the Year of our Lord 1264. as Pope *Clement* the Fifth his Succeſſor doth teſtify in the third Book of his *Clementines*, Tit. 16. where *Urban*'s Epiſtle by which he inſtituted this holy Day, is inſerted, wherein he ſaith he was moved ſo to do *by a Revelation made unto ſome Catholick Perſons*. By which Catholick Perſons he meaneth a Nun of *Leodium* called *Eva*, whom he had known when he was Archdeacon of the ſame place. This Woman ſaid that God had revealed unto her, that he did not like well that every Saint had his holy Day, and he none. Nevertheleſs, this Feaſt had been extinguiſhed, if *Clement* the Fifth had not inſtituted it again ſome forty Years after.

§ Binius Netis in Concilia in vita Urbani VI. Idque ex Molano & Petro Præmonſtrantem ſi. Vide Serarium de Proceſ. lib. 2. c. 9. & Epiſtolam Urbani IV. ad Evan.

CHAP. III.

CHAP. III. *How the change in the Lord's inſtitution, hath changed the nature of the Sacrament. And that in the* Maſs *there is no Conſecration.*

THIS change, and ſo horrible a depravation of the inſtitution of the Lord, hath wholly aboliſhed the nature of the Sacrament. For Sacraments are ſacred Signs. Not only the Antient, but alſo all the Doctors of the *Roman* Church do define the Sacrament after that manner, ſaying that *Sacramentum eſt ſacrum ſignum*. So in Baptiſm, Water is the ſign, and Chriſt's blood is the thing ſignified. And in the holy Supper, the Bread and the Wine are the ſigns, but the body and blood of Chriſt are the things ſignified. Even therefore, as if the Water were taken away from Baptiſm, it would be no more a Sacrament nor Baptiſm; ſo the Euchariſt in the *Roman* Church is no more a Sacrament, ſince the ſigns, to wit, the Bread and Wine are aboliſhed; inſtead of which they put Chriſt's natural body and blood, which they call the Sacrament. Wherefore the Council of *Trent* * ordaineth that the Sacrament be worſhipped. By this means Chriſt in the Maſs is the figure and the ſign of himſelf, as *Bellarmine* ‡ with the reſt teacheth: as if one ſhould ſay that a Man is a Picture of himſelf.

Moreover, the Sacraments are not inſtituted for to make Chriſt come down to us, but to liſt up our Hearts to him. Nor for to eat Chriſt with our Teeth, but to feed our Souls and ſtrengthen our faith.

Again, by Tranſubſtantiation the Conſecration of the Sacrament is deſtroyed; and there is nothing in the Maſs that is conſecrated. The Bread is not conſecrated, for they hold that the Bread is no more Bread. Chriſt's body is not conſecrated, for Chriſt cannot be conſecrated by Men. Neither can the accidents of Bread and Wine be conſecrated. For Lines, Colours, and Taſte, are not the offering which is pretended to

* Seſ. XIII. Chap. 5. ‡ Bellar. lib. 2. de Euchar. cap. 24. Chriſtus ſui ipſius figura fuit.

be

be offered unto God. Therefore there being nothing conſecrated, there is no Conſecration, and there being no Conſecration, there is no Sacrament.

CHAP. IV. *That by altering the Lord's Inſtitution, the* Roman *Church hath changed the nature of Chriſt.*

THIS change is gone ſo far, that Chriſt's human nature, by Tranſubſtantiation, is wholly deſtroyed and aboliſhed. For the Scripture ſpeaking of Chriſt's human nature, ſaith, that *he is like unto us in all things, Sin excepted* *. But the *Roman* Church gives unto Chriſt a body that is nothing like ours. Whence followeth, that he is no more our Brother: So that all the glory of the Faithful which conſiſteth in having a Brother who is the eternal Son of God, is altogether aboliſhed.

For the Church of *Rome* forgeth unto Chriſt a body, which is in many ſeveral places at one and the ſame time; which is in Heaven and upon ſeveral Altars, but not in the ſpace that is between. From whence it follows, that Chriſt's body is ſeparated from it ſelf, and far from it ſelf, and higher and lower than it ſelf. There is no leſs abſurdity in willing that an human Body be at the ſame time in ſeveral remote places, than to will that a man, in one and the ſelf ſame moment, be in two ſeveral Years, and ſo be young and old at once, and out-live himſelf.

The ſame Doctrine gives unto Chriſt a human Body, which is whole in every crum of the Hoſt, and hath his Head and his Feet in one and the ſelf ſame place, and both his Eyes under one point. Can a Man ſay that a Body whoſe parts are not one out of the other, and differ not in Situation, and which takes and fills no place, and is more Spiritual than the very Spirits themſelves, is a true human Body? And for that cauſe the Prieſts of the *Roman* Church ſhave or keep ſhort the Beard of their upper Lips. For that Church be-

* Heb. 2. 17. & c. 4. 15.

lieveth

lieveth that if a Prieſt ſhould dip his Muſtachio in the Chalice, the whole body of Chriſt would remain hang'd at every Hair thereof.

The ſame Doctrine forgeth unto Chriſt two Bodies of a contrary nature, and unto which are attributed contradictory things. For the body of Chriſt which was at the Table celebrating the Euchariſt, did ſpeak and ſtir his Hands; but he that was in the Mouths and Stomachs of the Apoſtles, neither ſpoke nor ſtirr'd his Hands. The Soul of Chriſt as he ſat at the Table, was in anguiſh: But that which was in the Apoſtle's Mouth, ſuffered no grief. Chriſt after he was riſen from the Table and entered into the Garden, did ſweat great drops of Blood; but he that was in the Apoſtles Stomachs, did not ſweat drops of Blood. Which of theſe two is our Saviour? Or if it be the ſame Chriſt, how is he contrary to himſelf.

Furthermore, by this Doctrine, the whole Hiſtory of Chriſt's Life is made ridiculous, and turned into a Fable. For if Chriſt's Body may be in ſeveral remote places at once, it may be ſaid that whilſt he was in the virgin's womb, peradventure he was in other wombs; and that whilſt he was upon the Croſs, he walked in *Spain*. From thence alſo follows, that all the Journies that Chriſt made to and fro, going and coming from *Galilea* to *Judea*, were to no purpoſe. For why did he go from *Galilea* to *Judea*, if he might be in both places at one and the ſame time, and be found in *Judea*, without budging from *Galilea*?

What? (ſay they) is not God omnipotent for to do this? I anſwer that God without queſtion could do all theſe things if he would. But I ſay, it is impoſſible that God ſhould will ſuch things. For he is no Lyar, and cannot contradict himſelf. But it were to contradict himſelf, if he would that at one and the ſame time a Man ſhould ſpeak and not ſpeak, ſtir and not ſtir, ſuffer and not ſuffer, and be far and remote, and divided from himſelf. He will have Chriſt's Body to be a true human Body. God will not have a thing ſo abſurd and contradictory, whereby they will that in the Hoſt there be accidents without a ſubject, and (as Pope

Innocent

Innocent the third teacheth †) that there be in the Hoſt greatneſs and nothing great, colour and nothing coloured. As if one ſhould ſuppoſe an Eclipſe of the Sun without a Sun, a haulting of a Leg and no Leg, a ſickneſs without a Sick-man. Beſides, the Omnipotency of God is not the Rule of our Faith, but his Will. By that means, a Man might maintain all the Fables of the *Alcoran*, ſaying that God is powerful ſo to do. Join to this, that God doth nothing but wiſely. Therefore he will never have Chriſt to be a ſubject to ſinful Men, now that he is glorified, and expoſed to the diſgraces and ignominy which they make him ſuffer every Day, whereof ſhall be ſpoken hereafter.

CHAP. V. *Of* Maldonat's, *audaciouſneſs in giving St.* Paul *and St.* Luke *the Lye: and in correcting St.* Matthew *and St.* Mark: *And touching the Fruit of the Vine.*

OF all the words which the Lord uſed in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, none gaul and vex our Adverſaries more, than thoſe which he pronounced in delivering the Cup, ſaying, *This Cup is the New Teſtament:* and thoſe by which he calleth that which was in the Cup, *the Fruit of the Vine.* For they are forc'd (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) to acknowledge in theſe words, *this cup is the new teſtament*, a figure like unto that which is in theſe words, *this is my body:* and confeſs that it is the ſign and remembrance of it. Beſides that to preſuppoſe that Chriſt called his blood the *fruit of the vine*, is out of all likelyhood.

Againſt theſe words of the Lord, *This Cup is the New Teſtament*, related by St. *Luke* and St. *Paul*, *Maldonat* the Jeſuit is mad and furious, and ſtirr'd up with an Audaciouſneſs full of impiety, and ſpeaketh of theſe two Organs of God's Spirit, as of two Lyars that have not related the Lord's words according to the truth: And will have Men to give credit to the

† Innoc. III. lib. 4. de myſter Miſſæ. Cap. 11. Eſt enim hic color & ſapor, quantitas & qualitas, cùm nihil alterutrò ſit coloratum aut ſapidum, quantum aut quale.

Teſtimony

Teſtimony of St. *Matthew*, which ſaith *This is my Blood:* And not to the Words of St. *Luke* and St. *Paul* which witneſs that the Lord ſaid, *This Cup is the New Teſtament.* Here be his Words upon the 28th Verſe of the xxvi. Chapter of St. *Matthew*: * *There needs not many Words. I deny that Chriſt ſaid theſe Words: For ſeeing that* Matthew *which was preſent, and* Mark *that had learned it of* Matthew, *writ that Chriſt gave his Blood in theſe Words, This is my Blood of the New Teſtament, it is reaſonable to believe that Chriſt did rather uſe the Words of* Matthew *and* Mark, *than thoſe of* Luke *and* Paul. And a little after, maintaining that Chriſt's intent was to give his own Blood, he ſpeaketh of St. *Luke* and of St. *Paul* as not having well conceived Chriſt's meaning, ſaying, Luke *and* Paul *ſeem to ſpeak in ſuch ſort, as if Chriſt had chiefly aimed at this,* viz. *to declare that he gave the New Teſtament rather than his Blood.* And a little after, *Though we ſhould feign and ſuppoſe that Chriſt ſpoke as it is written in* Luke *and* Paul, *&c.*

Truly this preſumption is intolerable, to dare contradict thus an Evangeliſt and an Apoſtle, *Luke* and *Paul*, ſaying, *I deny that Chriſt ſpoke theſe words.* And to make himſelf a Judge of the fidelity of the Apoſtles, ſaying, this Man is more credible than that Man, and deem that for to excuſe St. *Luke* and St. *Paul*, one muſt *feign* and preſuppoſe that which is not.

Every Man that hath any remnant of modeſty and fear of God, ſhall rather believe that all the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles are to be believed alike, and that all have ſpoken the Truth. For if we believe that they have reported ſome things falſly, all the reſt of the Scripture becomes ſuſpect and uncertain. And though we ſhould grant that St *Luke* and St. *Paul* have brought ſome alteration in the words of the Lord, yet were we bound to believe that they were moved by the holy Spirit to

* Nec multis opus eſt verbis. Nego Chriſtum hæc verba dixiſſe. Cum enim Matthæus qui aderat, & Marcus qui ex Matthæo didicerat, ſcribant Chriſtum his verbis ſanguinem ſuum tradidiſſe, Hic eſt ſanguis meus novi Teſtamenti, æquum eſt credere Matthæi, potius & Marci, quam Lucæ & Pauli verbis uſum eſſe, &c.

ſpeak

ſpeak after that manner for to clear and illuſtrate Chriſt's words, and turn the minds of Men from groſs thoughts, and take away from the Spirit of error the occaſion of forging a Tranſubſtantiation.

This Jeſuit having thus abuſed Saint *Paul* and Saint *Luke*, a little after, upon theſe words *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine*, cleaveth to Saint *Luke* his ſide againſt Saint *Mark* and Saint *Matthew*, and * will have Chriſt to have ſaid theſe words, *I will drink no more of this Fruit of the Vine*, of the cup of the Paſſover, againſt the teſtimony of *Matthew* and *Mark*, who report that Chriſt ſaid theſe words upon the cup of the holy Supper. Wherein indeed he maketh Chriſt a lyar. For after the Paſchal cup, he drank the cup of the Euchariſt, wherein there was wine. The Lord had ſpoken againſt the truth, if in drinking in the cup of the Paſchal Lamb, he had ſaid he would drink wine no more, ſeeing he drank of it a little after. Add to this, that Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Mark* make not any mention of the Paſchal cup; and conſequently call not the fruit of the Vine that which was in a cup whereof they ſpake not.

In this, *Maldonat* hath the Antiquity, Popes, Councils, and the Jeſuits themſelves againſt him, which maintain that theſe words *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine*, ought to be underſtood of the cup of the holy Supper. Saint *Cyprian* in the 63 Epiſtle, *The Lord ſaid, † I ſay unto you, I will drink no more henceforth of this creature of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom. Wherein we find that it was a mingled cup which the Lord offered, and that which he called his blood was wine.*

---

* Maldonat. in 26. Matth. verſ. 29. Hæc verba quæ Matthæus & Marcus referunt, Chriſtum de calice dixiſſe, non de eo calice dixit, quo ſanguinem ſuum dedit, ſed de eo qui in cœna agni Paſchalis a patre familias inter accumbentes diſtribui ſolebat. † Dico vobis, non bibam à modo, &c. Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuiſſe quem Dominus obtulit Apoſtolis, & vinum fuiſſe quod ſanguinem ſuum dixit.

The

The Council of *Wormes* in the fourth chapter. * *It was wine in the myſtery of our redemption, when the Lord ſaid, I will drink no more of the fruit of the Vine.*

Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, Chapter 27, † *Now that it was wine which Chriſt conſecrated in the Chalice, it appeareth by that which he addeth, I will drink no more of the fruit of this Vine.*

The Catechiſm of the Council of *Trent*, in the Chapter of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt: ‡ *The Catholick Church hath always taught, that our Saviour uſed Wine in the inſtitution of this Sacrament, ſeeing that himſelf ſaid, I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine.*

Salmeron the Jeſuit, in the IX Tome in the fourteenth treatiſe, holds the ſame; and the Jeſuit *Vaſquez* upon the third part of *Thomas*, Tome III in the Diſpute 196 chap. 4. §§ *I think Chriſt ſaid theſe words, I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine, of the chalice of his blood*, and proves his ſaying by the Fathers.

CHAP. VI. *How much Chriſt is diſhonoured by this Doctrine. And of the character indelible: And of the Power of creating ones Creator.*

THE very cautels of the Maſs do ſufficiently diſcover the abuſe, and maketh every man that loveth Chriſt ſhake with horror: At the end of the old editions of the *Roman* Decree, are added many penitential Canons, whereof the nine and thirtieth is ſuch: ‖ *When a mouſe eateth or gnaweth the body of Chriſt,*

---

* Apud Juonem part 2. fol. 65. Vinum fuit in redemptionis noſtræ myſterio, cum dixit, Non bibam de genimine, &c. † Quod autem vinum in calice conſecraverit, patet ex eo quod ipſe ſubjunxit, non bibam à modo, &c. ‡ Salvatorem vino in hujus Sacramenti inſtitutione uſum eſſe Catholica Eccleſia ſemper docuit. §§ Ego exiſtimo verba illa, Non bibam, &c. Chriſtum dixiſſe de calice ſanguinis ſui. ‖ Quando mus corrodit aut comedit Corpus Chriſti.

for

for the penance in this caſe, look for the ſecond diſtinction of the Conſecration, towards the end.

In the new Maſs-Book reviewed and amended by the Pope's authority, there is in the beginning a treatiſe of the defects that happen in the Maſs, where theſe rules are found in the third chapter : * *If the conſecrated hoſt vaniſh away by ſome accident, as if it be carried away with the wind or by ſome miracle; or eaten up by ſome beaſt, and cannot be found, then let another be conſecrated, beginning again about the place of the Maſs, Qui pridie, &c.* And in the tenth chapter : † *If a Fly or Spider fall into the chalice, and that the Prieſt's Stomach riſe not againſt it, and fear not any danger thereby, let him ſwallow the fly or ſpider with the blood.* And in the ſame Chapter : ‡ *If in winter the blood do freeze in the chalice, let the chalice be wrapped up in hot cloaths.* Note theſe words, *If the blood do freeze.* Whilſt Chriſt is full of glory in heaven, they thaw him here upon earth. Let them tell us what body or what ſubſtance is frozen in the chalice : For all Ice is a body.

But above all is to be noted, that which is found in the ſame Chapter : ‖ *If the Prieſt vomit up the Euchariſt, and that the ſpecies appear whole, they muſt be chewed again with reverence : unleſs the ſtomach ſhould loath them. For then the conſecrated ſpecies muſt be carefully ſevered, and put into a ſacred place, and after that be caſt into the reliquary or ſhrine wherein reliques are kept.*

Pope *Innocent* the third in the fourth Book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, Chapter 16, moveth a very

* De defectibus circa Miſſam occurrentibus, cap. 3. §. 7. Si hoſta conſecrata diſpareat vel caſu aliquo, ut vento, aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta, & nequeat repereri, tunc altera conſecretur ab eo loco incipiendo, Qui pridie, &c. † Cap. 10. Si muſca vel aranea cecîderit in calicem, & non fuerit Sacerdoti nauſea, nec ullum periculum timeat, ſumat cum ſanguine. ‡ Cap. 10. §. 11. Si in hieme congelatur ſanguis in calice, involvatur calix pannis calefactis. ‖ Cap. 10. §. 14. Si Sacerdos evomat Euchariſtiam, ſi ſpecies integræ appareant, reverenter ſumantur, niſi nauſea fiat. Tunc enim ſpecies conſecratæ caute ſeparentur, & in loco ſacro reponantur.

impor-

important queſtion. He aſketh that if a flux or looſeneſs takes a Prieſt that hath nothing in his ſtomach but conſecrated hoſts, what is the matter that comes out of his body? Of which difficulty the Pope rids himſelf wiſely, ſaying with the Apoſtle: *Be not wiſer than it behoveth, but be wiſe unto ſobriety.*

By theſe things it appeareth that God, ſtirred up with anger againſt men that have rejected his word, hath ſtrucken them with giddineſs. For who would ever have thought that Chriſtian men would have come to that point as to worſhip a God which may be ſtolen or carried away with the wind, ſo that one may ſay *God is loſt.* A God that may be gnawed by mice and devoured by brute beaſts. A God that is wrapped in the midſt of vomoting and ſpuing, and that muſt be eaten and chewed again. A God who being fallen down cannot riſe up again: Of whom their Doctors * ſay, that under the hoſt he cannot open his eyes, nor ſtir his hands; and that he is neither lying, ſitting, nor ſtanding.

Our Adverſaries do anſwer that when Mice have gnawed or carried away the conſecrated hoſt, or that a beaſt hath devoured it, Chriſt ſuffers no pain nor hurt thereby. But they cannot deny but that Chriſt thereby is expoſed to laughter, and ſuffers a greater ignominy than that of the Croſs. To be eaten by beaſts and vomited up, and wrapped among vomiting and ſpuing, is a thing more ſhameful than to be crucified. The *Turks* and *Pagans* will ſay, Is that the God of the Chriſtians that could not defend himſelf againſt Mice, and which is devoured by Dogs? Certain it is, that God would never make the glorious body of his Son to be ſubject to ſo many ignominies, without it were very beneficial and uſeful unto the Church. And yet our Adverſaries cannot tell us what good it doth to our Salvation that Chriſt ſhould be thus carried away by a mouſe, or devoured by brute beaſts.

* Vaſquez in 3 partem Thomæ Tomo 3. Deſp. 191. cap. 3. Neque agere, neque pati poteſt corpus Chriſti prout eſt in hoc Sacramento, corporea actione neque paſſione.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Tolet* the Jeſuit, in the ſecond Book of the Inſtitution of Prieſts, chapter 25, ſaith, † *The Prieſt can conſecrate many baſkets of bread, and a Tun of Wine.* If he can conſecrate one Tun, he may alſo conſecrate two, yea ten or twenty, and ſo may turn into blood all the Wine of a Market.

Whereupon 'tis neceſſary to know that the Church of *Rome* holdeth, that by conferring of the order of Prieſthood, an indelible character is engraven into the Soul of the Prieſt, ſo that the Pope himſelf cannot blot it out: And that a Prieſt degraded for Hereſy, or any other crime, may conſecrate and tranſubſtantiate bread into fleſh, and wine into blood, by vertue of that character remaining in him, though the function of his office be interdicted unto him. By that means, a Prieſt that hath forſaken the *Roman* Religion, yea a Prieſt § Sorcerer and a Magician, may tranſubſtantiate whole tuns of wine into blood, and make Chriſt's blood to be carried up and down in pints and bottles over all the taverns and tipling houſes of a town; which is truly to make Chriſt the ſport of Magicians and drunkards, and expoſe him to great ignominy.

By the ſame doctrine Chriſt is in the power of prieſts, who make him, and pin him up and walk him, and may if they will, caſt him into the fire: As *Gabriel Biel* a famous Doctor ſaith; in the firſt Leſſon upon the Canon of the Maſs: ‖ *The Prieſt hath great Power over the one and the other body of Chriſt*, that is to ſay, over the Church, and over the conſecrated hoſt. Whereupon he addeth: ‡ *Who ever ſaw things like unto this? He that hath created me (if I may ſay ſo)*

† Poteſt conſecrare Sacerdos multos cophinos panis & vini dolium. § Vaſquez Tomo III. in 3. partem Thomæ Diſp. 171. Cap. 3. Cum conſtet Sacerdotibus commiſſam fuiſſe poteſtatem conſecrandi, ita ut licet conſecrare velit in malum uſum, nempe pro veneficiis & incantationibus, conſecratio eorum effectum haberet. ‖ Biel Lect. 1. in Canonem Miſſæ. Super utrumque corpus Chriſti Sacerdos inſignes habet poteſtates. ‡ Quis hujus rei vidit ſimilia? Qui creavit me (ſi fas eſt dicere) dedit mihi creare ſe. Et qui creavit me, creatur mediante me.

hath

hath given me to create him; and he that hath created me without me, is created by my means. Thus Prieſts do create Chriſt in the Maſs, and make Chriſt who is made already; as if one ſhould beget a man already born.

CHAP. VII. *That the very words of the Maſs are contrary to Tranſubſtantiation.*

IN the midſt of this alteration of the Lord's Inſtitution, God hath permitted that in the Maſs ſome clauſes ſhould remain, which manifeſtly condemn the Tranſubſtantiation. For a great part of the Canon of the Maſs are prayers, which have been added when they did not yet believe the Tranſubſtantiation. As when the Prieſt, having before him the conſecrated hoſt, ſaith, * *We offer to thine excellent Majeſty of thy gifts and preſents a pure hoſt.* By theſe gifts, they underſtand at this day Chriſt himſelf. Surely, never a man in his right ſenſe called Chriſt gifts and preſents in the plural; but that agrees very well with the bread and wine.

The Prieſt goes on, ſaying, † *Upon which things vouchſafe to look with a chearful eye.* Is it not a jeſt to call Chriſt theſe things? and for a full meaſure of abuſe, to aſk of God that he may look upon Chriſt with a gracious eye: as if Chriſt had need of our recommendation?

Moreover, the Prieſt demanded of God afterward, that he would be pleaſed to have theſe gifts and preſents as acceptable, as he had acceptable the preſents of *Abel.* That is to ſay, that Chriſt may be as acceptable unto God, as the beaſts ſacrificed by *Abel.* This prayer is good, being ſaid upon the bread and the wine, but being ſaid upon Chriſt, it is altogether blaſphemous.

---

* Offerimus præclaræ tuæ Majeſtati de tuis donis & datis hoſtiam puram. † Supra quæ propitio ac ſereno vultu reſpicere digneris, & accepta habere, ſicut accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui juſti Abel.

Chiefly

Chiefly, this is evident, in that the Prieſt looking upon the conſecrated hoſt and the chalice, ſaith, that * *by Chriſt our Lord, God creates always for us theſe good things, ſanctifies them, and vivifies them.* Can Chriſt be called *theſe good things?* Doth God create and vivify Chriſt always? And ſince God creates theſe things through Jeſus Chriſt, as the Maſs ſaith, it is certain theſe things are not Chriſt. But all that agrees very well with the bread and wine.

We muſt not omit that Chriſt giving the bread to his Diſciples, ſaid ſimply, *Take, Eat:* But in the Canon of the Maſs there is, *Accipite & manducate ex hoc omnes: Take and eat all of it.* Whoſoever added theſe words *EX HOC,* he did not believe that in the Euchariſt the Lord's body was really eaten by the mouth of the body. For *to eat of that,* is to eat a part thereof, and not all. Which cannot be ſaid of Chriſt's natural body.

CHAP. VIII. *Recrimination of our Adverſaries.*

THE Prophet *Eliſha* accuſed the *Iſraelites* of Idolatry, and of forſaking God's Covenant. They out of revenge called him bald pate, which was a reproach nothing belonging to the doctrine. We ſtand upon the like terms with our Adverſaries. We accuſe the *Roman* Church to have brought in Idolatry in the Maſs, worſhipping of the Sacrament, and a Sacrifice of Chriſt's body, which Chriſt hath not inſtituted: To have taken away from the people the half of the Sacrament: To have changed the nature of the Sacrament yea, of Chriſt himſelf: which are things of importance, and altogether eſſential to the Euchariſt and to the Chriſtian Religion. But they, out of recrimination, tell us, that we have likewiſe changed many things in the Lord's Inſtitution. For (ſay they) ye ſolemnize the Supper in the morning; but Chriſt inſtituted it after Supper. Ye celebrate it in a Temple: but Chriſt

* Per Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum, per quem hæc omnia, Domine, ſemper bona creas, ſanctificas, vivificas, benedicis.

did celebrate it in an upper Chamber. Ye receive Women to the Communion: But when Chriſt inſtituted the Euchariſt, there were none but men. Things, whereof the two firſt are indifferent, and all three not only are not of the eſſence of that Sacrament, but even make no part of that action.

To this Objection, Chriſt affords us an anſwer. For he ſaid, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* He ſaid not *Do this in ſuch a Place, nor at ſuch an hour, nor with ſuch a Sex or ſuch perſons:* But he ſaid, *Do this,* commanding us to do as he hath done, and to imitate his action. Chriſt did not exclude women. If any had been there preſent, worthy to be partakers of the holy Supper, he would not have rejected them.

CHAP. IX. *Cauſes why the Pope admitteth not of any alteration in the Maſs, and will not conform himſelf to the Lord's Inſtitution.*

THOUGH the abuſe be ſo apparent, yet the Church of *Rome* and the Pope will not let go their hold, and ſuffer any change or alteration to be made in the Maſs. The cauſe of that is eaſy to be known. For if the Church of *Rome* ſhould yield to the leaſt alteration, it would overthrow the three Maxims that are the baſis whereon all Popery is grounded, whereof the firſt is, that *the Church of Rome cannot err:* The ſecond, that *the Pope and Church of Rome are not ſubject to the holy Scripture, and have greater authority than the holy Scripture:* The third, that *the Pope and Church of Rome have power to change God's Commandments, and make new Articles of Faith.* All which things are ſeen not only by practice, in that all the doctrine of the *Roman* Church is contrary to the holy Scripture, but alſo by examples of Popiſh Councils, and open profeſſion of the principal Doctors of that Church: Whereof I will alledge ſome places in the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. X. *Places wherein the Doctors and Councils of the Roman Church maintain, that the Pope and the Church of Rome are not ſubject to the Scripture, and have greater authority than the Scripture, and may make void and aboliſh the Commandments of God.*

THE Romiſh Decree and its Gloſſes are all ſtuffed with this brave maxim, † that the Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, and againſt the Old Teſtament, and may diſpenſe with the Law, as being above the Law: And that he may diſpenſe againſt the Goſpel in giving interpretation to it.

In the firſt book of the Decretals of *Gregory* the 9th, *Title* 7. at the Chapter *Quanto perſonam*, the Pope *Innocent* the third ſaith, that *the Pope, on earth, holdeth not the place of a meer man, but of a very God.* And thereupon the Gloſs of the Doctors ſaith: *The Pope of nothing can make ſomething:* And *a ſentence that is of no value, he can make it to be ſomething: Becauſe in the thing that he willeth, his will ſtands him inſtead of reaſon: And no man ſaith to him, wherefore doeſt thou do that? For he may diſpenſe above the Law, and make of injuſtice Juſtice.*

Thomas Aquinas, whom the Pope hath Sainted, ſaith: * *A new edition of a Creed, belongeth ſolely to the Pope's authority.* The ſame is defined by the Council of *Florence* in the laſt Seſſion, to wit, that the Pope may add to the Creed. That is one of the crimes for which *Luther* was anathematiſed by Pope *Leo* the

† Can Lect. Diſt. 34. in Gloſſ. Papa diſpenſat contra Apoſtolum. Innoc. III. Decretal. de Conceſſione Præbend. Tit. 8. cap. Propoſuit. Secundum plenitudinem poteſtatis de jure poſſumus ſupra jus diſpenſare. Et ibi Gloſſa, Nam contra Apoſtolum diſpenſat. Item contra vetus Teſtamentum. Et Gloſſa Canonis ſunt quidam, Cauſ. 25. quæſt. 1. Papa diſpenſat in Evangelio interpretando ipſum.

* Thom. 2. 2. quæſt. 1. art. 10. Ad ſolam authoritatem ſummi Pontificis pertinet nova editio Symboli.

tenth, *viz.* becauſe he had taught, ‡ *that it is not in the power of the Pope and of the Roman Church, to eſtabliſh any Articles of faith:* As is to be ſeen in the Bull added to the laſt Council of *Lateran.*

The Cardinal *du Perron* in his book againſt the King of Great Britain, hath a Chapter * whoſe title is ſuch: *Of the Church's authority, in changing of things contained in the Scriptures.*

Vaſquez the Jeſuit in the third Tome upon the third part of *Thomas*, Diſput. 216. ſpeaking of this Commandment of the Lord, *Drink ye all of it*, ſaith, § *Though even we ſhould grant that this was a Commandment of the Apoſtles; yet the Church and the ſovereign Biſhop might aboliſh it upon good grounds. For the Apoſtles power to make laws, was not greater than the power of the Church and of the Pope.*

Salmeron the Jeſuit in the ſecond Prolegom. ‖ *It is no wonder if the Scripture be ſubject to the Church, which hath the Spirit.* The ſame man in the ninth Tome and 13th Treatiſe, † diſputing of the change and alteration in the form of the Sacrament, ſpeaks thus: *We are no way tyed to imitate Chriſt in all things, except in good manners.* By that, he teacheth we are not bound to imitate Chriſt in the Sacraments, nor in the communion under one kind, nor in that he celebrated the holy Supper in a known tongue, nor in the doctrine of Purgatory, nor in the Sacrifice of the Maſs, &c. For theſe things concern not manners.

The ſame, in the firſt Prolegom. ** *The Church's Authority is more Ancient and more Worthy, than the Au-*

‡ Bulla exurge Leonis X. ſubjecta Concilio Lateranenſi, inter errores Lutheri hic refertur. Certum eſt in manu Eccleſiæ aut Papæ prorſus non eſſe ſtatuere articulos fidei.

* 2 Book, Obſervat. 3. Cap. 3.

§ Vaſquez in 3. Thom. Tomo. 3. Diſput. 216. num. 60. Licet concederemus hoc fuiſſe Apoſtolorum præceptum, nihilominus Eccleſia & ſummus Pontifex potuerunt illud juſtis de cauſis abrogare, &c.

‖ Non mirum ſi Scriptura Eccleſiæ dei quæ ſpiritum habet ſubjicitur.

† §. Ad illud. Nequaquam aſtringimur in omnibus Chriſtum imitari, niſi in bonis moribus.

** Eccleſiæ authoritas antiquior & dignior authoritate Scripturæ.

thority

thority of the Scriptures, That, truly, is to ſay that Men are above God. For it is God that ſpeaketh in the holy Scriptures. Can a Man ſay without impiety that the Church of Iſrael was above the Law, which God had written in two Tables? Are ſubjects above the Laws? Is not the Pope ſubject to the Law of God?

The ſame Jeſuit ſaith, that *the* § *Chriſtian Religion admitteth ſtill of ſome additions in things eſſential.* Whence followeth that the Chriſtian Religion is not yet perfect, ſince that eſſential Articles may be added thereunto.

John Almain, a Sorboniſt, in his Book of the Eccleſiaſtical and Temporal power, Chap. 12. ¶ *The Pope may diſpenſe in things that are forbidden by God's Law:* And alledges thereupon *Panormitanus* and *Angelus*.

Andradius in the ſecond Book of the Defence of the Tridentine Faith: * *The Roman Biſhops in defining many things that were hidden before, are accuſtomed to enlarge the Creed.* And in the ſame place: ‡ *It appeareth thoſe have not erred which ſay that the Roman Biſhops may ſome times diſpenſe from obeying the Laws of the Apoſtle* St. *Paul and the four firſt Councils.* Item: † *Our Anceſtors, excellent Men in Piety, have cancelled and abrogated many of the Apoſtles Decrees.*

Cardinal *Bellarmin* in the fourth Book de Pontif. Chap. 5. *If the Pope ſhould err in commanding the Vices, and forbidding Virtues, the Church were bound to believe that Vices be good, and Virtues bad, unleſs ſhe would Sin againſt her own Conſcience.*

The ſame Cardinal in the 31. Chap. againſt *Barklay*,

---

§ Salm Tomo XIII. part 3 Diſp. 6. §. Eſt ergò Doctrina fidei admittit additionem in eſſentialibus.

¶ Papa poteſt diſpenſare in illis quæ ſunt lege Dei prohibita.

* Romanos Pontifices multa definiendo quæ ante latitabant, ſymbolum fidei augere conſueviſſe.

‡ Liquet minime eos erraſſe qui dicunt Rom. Pontifices poſſe nonnunquam in legibus diſpenſare à Paulo & à quatuor primis Conciliis.

† Minime vero majores noſtri religione & pietate excellentes Apoſtolorum hæc & quam plurima alia decreta refigere in animum induxiſſent, niſi intellexiſſent, &c.

In a good ſenſe Chriſt gave to Peter (that is to ſay to the Pope) *the Power to do that that which is Sin be not Sin, and that which is not Sin to be Sin.*

The Romiſh Decree in the Fortieth Diſtinction, Canon Si Papa, hath theſe words: * *If the Pope being careleſs of his own Salvation and of the Salvation of his Brethren, leadeth by Troops with him, firſt Slave of Hell Fire, innumerable Peoples to be tormented with him with many Plagues eternally, none dares reprove him of his Faults. Becauſe that he that is to be Judge of all Men, is to be judged of none: Except he do ſwerve from the Faith.*

Stapleton an Engliſh Doctor, in the ſecond Book of the Authority of the Scripture, Chap. 11. ‡ *I have ſaid, and ſay ſtill, that the Church is the Rule of the Scripture.* By this reckoning, Sinners ſhall rule God, and ſhall be Maſters of his word.

Lindan in the *Index* of the Chapters of the fifth Book of his *Panoplia: The Church by the will of God is not tied to the Scriptures.* For he, and the reſt with him, will have the Church bound to the *Tradition* of the Church, that is to ſay to the Laws which ſhe giveth to her ſelf. Now by the Church they underſtand always the *Roman* Church, and by the *Roman* Church the Pope.

Coſterus the Jeſuit in his *Enchiridion*, Chap. 1. calleth the *Tradition* of the *Roman* Church a ſecond kind of Scripture, and ſaith, that *the* § *Excellency of this Scripture goes far beyond the Scriptures which the Apoſtles left unto us Written in Parchments.*

Gregory de Valentia the Jeſuit, in the fourth Book

---

* Si Papa ſuæ & fraternæ ſalutis negligens deprehenditur, &c. nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim ſecum ducit primo mancipio gehennæ cum ipſo plagis multis in æternum vapulaturos. Hujus culpæ iſtic redarguere præſumit mortalium nullus, quia cunctos ipſe judicaturus à nemine eſt judicandus, niſi ſit à fide devius.

‡ Dixi & dico non tam ipſius fidei regulam in ſe eſſe Scripturam quam ipſarum Scripturarum regulem eſſe fidem Eccleſiæ.

§ Hujus Scripturæ præſtantia multis partibus ſuperat Scripturas quas nobis in membranis Apoſtoli reliquerunt.

of

of his *Analyſis*, Chap. 2. * *The Scripture is not the Judge of Controverſies.* And in the third Chapter. † *The Scripture is no ſufficient Rule of Faith.* And in the fourth Chapter. § *The Scripture by the ſecret Judgment of God, is a ſtumbling Block, and a Temptation to the Feet of Fools, to the end that thoſe which will rely upon it alone, may eaſily ſtumble and ſwerve from the way.* Wherefore after he hath withdrawn us from the holy Scriptures, in the ſeventh Book he ſends us back to the Pope, ſaying, ‡ *The Roman Biſhop is he in whom reſideth that Authority of Judging wholly of all the Controverſies of Faith.* According as *Andradius* ſaith in the firſt Book of the *Defence of the Tridentin Faith, our faith is contained and ſubſiſteth by the Pope's faith, and all Mens Salvation depends on his Authority.*

The ſame Jeſuit in his firſt Book of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Chapter forty, finding no Proofs in the Scriptures whereon to ground the Sacrifice of the Maſs, ſaith, that ‖ *If this Worſhip or Service were not inſtituted of God: Yet theſe Men could not draw from thence this concluſion, that it is not lawful. For that* (viz. to be inſtituted by God) *is in no wiſe required for to make a Worſhip or a Sacrifice to be good.* And in his ſecond Book: ‡‡ *Here above and often elſewhere I have ſhewed, that for the goodneſs of a worſhip or ſervice, God's Commandment is not required.*

For theſe cauſes, in the fourth Tome of his Com-

---

* Scripturam ſacram non eſſe judicem omnium controverſiarum fidei probatur.

† Probatur ſecundo Scripturam non eſſe ſufficientem fidei regulam.

§ Scripturam arcano Dei judicio eſſe velut lapidem offenſionis, & in tentationem pedibus inſipientium, ut qui velint ea ſola niti, facillime impingant & errent.

‡ Pontifex Romanus ipſe eſt in qui authoritas alla reſidet quæ in Eccleſia extat ad judicandum de omnibus omnino controverſiis.

‖ Si maxime hic cultus non eſſet inſtitutus à Deo, concluditamen ab iſtis non poſſet illum non eſſe legitimum, cum id ad bonitatem cultus & ſacrificii minime requiratur.

‡‡ At ego ſuprà & aliàs ſæpius oſtendi præceptum Dei non requiri ad bonitatem cultus.

mentaries, he affirmeth that § *there are ſome things which in the latter times are better ordained than they were at the beginning*. For he ſuppoſeth that the Church now is better inſtructed than it was in the Apoſtles time.

Of this power which the *Roman* Church taketh upon herſelf, to change, cancel, and make void the Commandments of the Lord, we have a remarkable Example in the Council of *Conſtance*, kept in the Year 1416, which is the firſt Council that took away the Cup from the People. That Council acknowledgeth in the 13th Seſſion, that Chriſt inſtituted the Euchariſt under both kinds, and that in the Primitive Church the People received the Cup. Yet withal it dare ſay, ‡ *that in ſome parts of the World ſome dare affirm raſhly, that the Chriſtian People ought to take the Euchariſt under both kinds:* As if it were a Temerity to follow Chriſt's example. And ordaining that henceforth the People ſhall receive the Species of the Bread only, will have *this cuſtom to be held as a Law, which it is not lawful to reprove or change.* Finally, this Council concludeth, that *thoſe which obſtinately affirm the Contrary, ought to be driven out as Hereticks, and grievouſly puniſhed.*

With the like Audacity, the Council of *Trent* in the 5th Seſſion, † ſpeaking of the Concupiſcence forbidden in God's Law, which St. *Paul* in the ſeventh Chapter to the *Romans* calleth Sin, declareth, and defineth, that Concupiſcence is no Sin in thoſe that are Regenerate, that is to ſay Baptized: And that St. *Paul* ſpake neither truly nor properly. Whence will follow, that a Baptized Perſon may without Sin, covet his neighbour's Wife: But in an unbaptized Perſon it is a Sin.

---

§ Greg. de Val. Tomo IV. Diſp. 6. qu. 8. Punct. 5. §. 10. Et certe quæd. n poſterioribus temporibus rectius inſtituta eſſe, quàm initio ſe haberent.

‡ Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie aſſerere præſumant populum Chriſtianum debere Sacramentum Euchariſtiæ ſub utraque panis & vini ſpecie ſuſcipere.

† Hanc concupiſcentiam quam aliquando Apoſtolus peccatum appellat, ſancta Synodus declarat Eccleſiam Catholicam nunquam intelleriſſe peccatum appellari quod vere & proprie in renatis peccatum ſit.

Now,

Now, let every unpartial Reader Judge, with what reaſon our Adverſaries call our Religion a new Religion, ſeeing they do declare themſelves, that they may change the Commandments of God, add to the Creed, and make a new Religion, and that in the Maſs they are not tied to the Lord's Inſtitution.

CHAP. XI. *That our Expoſition of theſe words,* This is my Body, *is conformable to the Scripture, and to the nature of Sacraments, and approved by the Ancient Fathers, and confirmed by our Adverſaries.*

THE Interpretation that we give of theſe words, *This is my body*, is the ſame which Chriſt himſelf giveth in the ſame Place, *viz.* that *it is his Commemoration.* And the ſame which St. *Paul* giveth in the 10th Chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians. *The Bread which we break, is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt.* The Sacrament being a Figure, there is nothing more fit than to make uſe of a Figure, drawn from the nature of the Action, by which the name of the thing Signified, is given to the Sign. Even, as in the Seventeenth of *Geneſis*, the Sacrament of Circumciſion is called *the Covenant of God*, * becauſe it was the Sign and remembrance of it. So in the Twelfth of *Exodus*, the Sacrament of the Paſchal Lamb, is called the *Paſſover*, becauſe it was a Memorial of the Paſſover of the Angel ſparing the Houſes of the Iſrealites.

And St. *Paul* 1 *Corinth.* 10. ſpeaking of the Rock which guſh'd out waters in the Wilderneſs, ſaith, that *this Rock was Chriſt*, becauſe it was the Figure of Chriſt. As *Auſtin* ſaith, in the Eighteenth Book of the City of God, Chapter 48 †. *The Apoſtle ſaith, the Rock was Chriſt, becauſe that Rock did ſignify Chriſt.* And in the 57th queſtion upon the *Leviticus: The thing which ſignifieth, is wont to bear the name of the thing ſignified, as it is written, ſeven ears of corn are*

* Ferus in 17. Geniſ. Pactum hoc loco ſumitur pro ſigno pacti. Eman. Sa, prima editione in Notis, Pactum. id eſt ſignum pacti.

† Dictum eſt ab Apoſtolo, petra erat Chriſtus, quia petra illa de qua hoc dictum eſt, ſignificabat Chriſtum.

ſeven years, and ſeven kine are ſeven years, and many ſuch like things. ‡ *Thence comes what is ſaid, that the rock was Chriſt. He did not ſay the rock ſignifieth Chriſt, but as if it were that which it was not in ſubſtance, but only by ſignification.* Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, chap. 7. ſaith, *Petra erat Chriſtus, id eſt, ſignificabat Chriſtum. The rock was Chriſt, that is to ſay, did ſignify Chriſt.* And *Aquinas* in the Expoſition of this Epiſtle. * *The rock was Chriſt, not in ſubſtance, but by ſignification.* *Lombardus* in his Commentary upon this chapter, ‖ *They did drink of the rock, which ſignified Chriſt.* Which thing is confirm'd by that word *was*. For *Bellarmin* that doth invert theſe words, and tranſlated *Chriſt was the rock*, ſeems to imply that Chriſt was then the rock, but is not now.

And the ſame Apoſtle to the *Romans*, chap. 6. 4. ſaith, *we are buried in Chriſt's death by baptiſm*, becauſe baptiſm ſignifieth to us, that our ſins are as buried with Chriſt, and that we are to be made conformable to his death.

And without extending my ſelf further upon this: Chriſt giving the cup, ſaid, *This cup is the new teſtament in my blood.* Wherein there are two figures, as *Salmeron* the Jeſuit ſaith truly. § *There is* (ſaith he) *a double Metonymie, by which the continent is put for the thing contained, that is to ſay, the cup for the wine contained therein: The other, that that which is contained in the chalice, is called the covenant or teſtament, for that it is the ſymbol or ſign of it becauſe of the ſpe-*

‡ Hinc eſt quod dictum eſt Petra erat Chriſtus. Non enim dixit, petra ſignificabat Chriſtum, ſed tanquam hoc eſſet, quod utique per ſubſtantiam non hoc erat, ſed per ſignificationem.

* Petra erat Chriſtus, non per ſubſtantiam, ſed per ſignificationem.

‖ Bibebant de petra ſpirituali, ſcilicet quæ Chriſtum ſignificabat.

§ Salm. Tomo IX. Tra. XV. pag. 98. & 99. Subeſt in his verbis duplex Metonymia: prima qua continens ponitur pro contento, id eſt poculum ſive calix pro vino, eo quod vinum in ipſo continetur. Altera eſt qua contentum in poculo, id eſt ſanguis ſub ſpecie vini, fœdus vel Teſtamentum dicitur Novum, cum ſit ejus ſymbolum propter ſpecies.

cies. And a little after. ‡ *The blood is called the new teſtament, as the circumciſion is called the covenant, becauſe it repreſenteth that covenant.* And *Thomas Aquinas* in his Commentary upon the eleventh chapter of the firſt to the *Corinthians*: § *This cup is the new teſtament in my blood, as if he did ſay, by that which is contained in this cup, is made a commemoration of the new teſtament, which was confirmed by Chriſt's blood.* And *Emanuel Sa* the Jeſuit, in the firſt edition of his notes upon the firſt to the *Corinthians*, chap. 11, ſaith, that the word *IS implies as much as containeth or ſignifieth.*

This manner of ſpeaking is ordinary, to ſay a mourning ſuit, becauſe it is a ſign of mourning, and a celeſtial ſphere, for the figure of a heavenly ſphere: And in ſhewing of maps, to ſay, this is *France*, and that is *Spain.* And to be lodged at the *Eagle*, or at the *Swan*, for the ſign of the Eagle, or of the Swan. So doth St. *Auſtin* ſay in the fifty ſeventh queſtion upon *Leviticus*, *the thing which ſignifieth, is wont to be called by the name of the thing ſignified.* And *Theodoret* in the firſt dialogue, ſpeaking of theſe words *this is my body*, ſaith, that *the Lord gave unto the ſign the name of his body.* And *Tertullian* in his fourth book againſt *Marcion*, chap. 40. *He made it to be his body*, ſaying, *This is my body, that is to ſay the figure of my body.* St. *Auſtin* in the 23 epiſtle to *Boniface*, is very expreſs: *If Sacraments had not ſome reſemblance of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they would be no Sacraments. But becauſe of this reſemblance, they take very often the name of the things themſelves. Even then as the Sacrament of Chriſt's body, is in a manner the body of Chriſt: So the Sacrament of faith, to wit Baptiſm, is faith.* Note that he ſaith that the Sacrament of Chriſt's body is the body of Chriſt, after the ſame manner as Baptiſm is faith.

Therefore our adverſaries ſay very ignorantly, that figures elſewhere are receiveable; but in the articles of

‡ Idem ibidem pag. 100. Dicitur ſanguis Novum Teſtamentum ſicut circumciſio dicitur foedus, quia illud foedus repreſentat.

§ Hic calix eſt N. T. in meo ſanguine, quaſi dicat. Per id quod in hoc calice continetur, commemoratur N. T. &c.

faith

ſaith and inſtitution of a Sacrament, figures are no way convenient or agreeable. For we have produced many examples of figures in the inſtitution of Sacraments: And they themſelves acknowledge two figures in theſe words: *This cup is the new Teſtament.* And touching the Articles of faith, the Creed ſaith, that *Chriſt ſitteth at the right hand of God,* which is a figurative kind of ſpeech; for God hath no right hand. The whole Goſpel is comprized under theſe words, *Jeſus is the Lamb of God*: And all Popery is grounded upon theſe words: *Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,* which be all figurative words.

And it is to be obſerved that when Chriſt inſtituted this holy Sacrament, he ſpake in the *Jewiſh* language, which is a dialect of the *Syrian* tongue, ſaying * *Hanau pagri,* that is to ſay, *this my dead body,* ſupplying the word *IS,* after the manner of the *Hebrews* and *Syrians.* He did then ſay to his Diſciples, that he gave them his dead body. Which could not be true but in taking it figuratively: For the body of Chriſt was not dead when he did inſtitute this Sacrament. But it is very true in the ſenſe that we take it, to wit, that the bread which he did brake, and give to his Diſciples, was the figure or remembrance of his body, dead for us. For we have ſhewed already, that in the holy ſupper Chriſt's body is preſented to our faith, not as glorious and ſpiritual, but as broken, and dying, and dead for us. This is confirmed in that in the Evangeliſts, this word σῶμα, which ſignifieth body, is in moſt places taken for a dead body: As in the 17th of St. *Luke* Verſe 37. ‡ *Whereſoever the body is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together.* And *Matthew* 27. 52. † *Many bodies of Saints which ſlept, aroſe.* And *Mark* 14. 8. μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμα, *to anoint the body.* For the proper word in *Greek* for

---

* נבל pro cadavere. 1 Sam. 17. 46. Amos. 6. 3. Eſ. 14. 19. 2 Paral. 20. 24. Gen. 15. 11. Num. 19. 29.

‡ ὅπου τὸ σῶμα &c.

† σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

to ſignify a dead body, is σῶμα. 'Tis true that in the Syriack Teſtament, the word *Peger* is taken ſometimes for a living body: But it is not credible that Chriſt took this word in an other ſenſe than it is taken in the Old Teſtament, where it ſignifieth always a *dead body*.

Neither is it to be omitted that St. *Paul* calls oftentimes the Church Chriſt's body, *Epheſ.* 1. 23, and Chapter 5. 23. If then from theſe words, *this is my body*, they will infer that the bread is tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's body: By the like reaſon when the Scripture ſaith that *the Church is the body of Chriſt*, it may be inferred that the Church is tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's body.

CHAP. XII. *That our Adverſaries, to avoid a clear and natural figure, forge a multitude of harſh and unuſual ones, and ſpake but in figurative terms. And of* Berengarius *his confeſſion.*

OUR Adverſaries, who make a ſhew to be enemies to Figures, forge nevertheleſs a great number of abſurd and violent figures, and turn all into figures.

When Chriſt ſaith, *This is my body*, by *This*, they underſtand an *individuum Vagum*, or *that which is under theſe ſpecies*; without determining any thing. Others interpret the word *IS*, by ſhall be or ſhall become. For they ſay that the Tranſubſtantiation is not made or effected, till the words be pronounced.

When the Evangeliſts ſay that the Lord gave bread, by this word *bread*, they underſtand *fleſh*. And we have heard them confeſs that theſe words, *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood*, are figurative.

By their doctrine, which puts the body into the cup, Chriſt giving the cup, might have ſaid *this is my body*, and had ſpoken truly, if we believe them.

Chriſt called that which he drank in the Euchariſt, the *fruit of the Vine*. But our Adverſaries by the fruit of the Vine, will have the blood to be underſtood.

By

By theſe words *do this*, they underſtand *Sacrifice me*; but the words following, *Do this in remembrance of me*, do refute that interpretation. For it is impoſſible to Sacrifice Chriſt in remembrance of Chriſt.

We ſhall ſee anon that when in the 6th of St. *John* Verſe 53. Chriſt ſaith, *Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you:* our adverſaries, leſt they ſhould be accuſed of taking the life from the lay people, in depriving them of the cup, by the word *drinking*, they underſtand *eating*. And that when Chriſt ſaith, *I leave the World, and am no more in the world*, they add this tail to it, to wit, *by my viſible preſence*.

We have ſeen before, that the Apoſtle ſaith four ſeveral times, that in the Lord's Supper, we break bread and eat bread. To ſhun the force of theſe words, they wreſt them into figures, ſaying that it is not bread that we eat: But that figuratively Chriſt's body is called *bread*, becauſe it ſeems to be ſo. Which thing they know to be falſe; for Chriſt's body never ſeem'd to be bread. *Item*, they ſay that it is called bread, becauſe it was bread before the conſecration. Which alſo is falſe For the Lord's body was never bread. To ſuch figures, Rhetorick affords no name.

They bring indeed for example, *Moſes*'s Rod, which is ſtill called a rod after it was turned into a Serpent: and the water of the wedding of § *Cana*, which is ſtill called water after it was turned into wine. Which are examples making againſt them. For of that rod it is expreſly ſaid, that it was *turned into a Serpent*, *Exod.* 4. 3. And of that water it is ſaid in expreſs terms that *it was turned into wine*, *John* 2. 9. But of the bread of the holy Supper, it is not ſaid that it was converted into fleſh. Of this Serpent one might have truly ſaid that it was once a rod: And of this wine, that it was once water, becauſe it was the ſame matter clothed with another form. But of Chriſt's body it cannot be ſaid truly that ever it was bread. The matter or ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt, is not

§ John 2.

the

the matter of the bread. For Chriſt's body is not made of bread, and was never bread.

Others ſay, that the Apoſtle ſaith not, *When ye eat bread*, but when ye eat *of this bread*, underſtanding by the pronoun *This*, a ſpiritual and heavenly bread. But they conſider not that the Apoſtle in the firſt to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 11 ſaith not *THIS BREAD*: but *the bread that we brake*. And St. *Luke* in the 20th of the *Acts*, 7th Verſe. *The Diſciples came together to brake bread*. There, their Philoſophy fails them. They muſt alſo learn that when the Scripture taketh this word *Bread* in a ſpiritual ſenſe, it is never oppoſed to the cup; becauſe that when the queſtion is of a ſpiritual food, to eat and to drink are but one and the ſame thing. But St. *Paul* oppoſeth this bread to that cup, ſaying, *Let every man eat of this bread, and drink of this cup*.

That if any one conſider exactly all the terms which our Adverſaries uſe in this matter, he ſhall perceive that they be unintelligible figures. They ſay that the Prieſt breaketh the hoſt, and that this hoſt is the body of Chriſt, which nevertheleſs cannot be broken. They ſay they lift up God, but God cannot be lifted up. They ſay the conſecrated hoſt is round: And that Chriſt's body is in the conſecrated hoſt. Whence will follow in good logick, that the body of Chriſt is round; which, nevertheleſs, they do not believe. They grant both propoſitions, and deny the concluſion; which is againſt the common ſenſe.

And when they ſpake of drinking the cup, by drinking, they underſtand a ſwallowing down of fleſh and bones, and the ſoul of Chriſt with his Divinity.

The Roman Council under *Nicholas* the ſecond, preſcribed to *Berengarius* a form of abjuration of his doctrine, in the moſt exquiſite and formal terms that ever they could deviſe. Theſe terms are, that † *he proteſteth to ſtand and keep himſelf cloſe to the doctrine of the Pope and Church of* Rome, *to wit, that the bread*

† This confeſſion of Berengarius is to be found in the 2 Diſtinction of the Conſecration at the Canon, Ego Berengarius.

and

and the wine which are upon the Altar, are not only the Sacrament, but alſo the very body and blood of Chriſt. Words that muſt be taken in a quite contrary ſenſe: For the Church of *Rome* believeth not that the bread is the true body of Chriſt. *Item*, they make him ſay *that Chriſt's body is ſenſibly handled by the Prieſt, and is broken and cruſhed with the teeth of the faithful.* But the Doctors Gloſs noteth in the margent theſe words. *Except thou underſtandeſt aright* Berengarius *his words, thou ſhalt fall into a greater herecy than* Berengarius *did.* It is the property of untruth, to intangle it ſelf with figures, and not to underſtand it ſelf.

CHAP. XIII. *Of the Aſcenſion of the Lord and of his abſence: And of that our Adverſaries ſay that in the Sacrament he is Sacramentally preſent.*

ABOVE all things the Gloſſes and figures of our Adverſaries are intolerable, when as they wreſt the places of Scripture wherein mention is made of Chriſt's aſcenſion and of his departure out of this world.

The Lord in the 12th Chapter of St. *John*, 8 Verſe, ſaith, *The poor ye have always, but me ye have not always.* And in the 14th Chapter, 3 Verſe. *If I go I will come again*, ſpeaking of his return at the day of Judgment. And in the Chapter 17. 11, ſpeaking of his Aſcenſion near at hand, as if it were paſt, he ſaith; *Now I am no more in the World.* St. *Peter* in the third Chapter of the Acts of the Apoſtles, ſaith, *Heaven muſt contain him, until the times of the reſtitution of all things*, which is the Day of Judgment.

All theſe words are as many lies, if we believe the Tranſubſtantiation. For in theſe places Chriſt ſaith that he hath left the World, and is no more in the World, and that we ſhall not have him always. But if we believe the Tranſubſtantiation, we muſt ſay Chriſt hath not left the world, but is much more preſent than he was before his aſcenſion. For then he

was

was but in one place at once upon earth, but now they will have him to be preſent upon a million of Altars, in boxes, and in bellies.

And for to conclude that place of St. *Peter* which ſaith, *that Heaven muſt contain him* until the day of reſtitution: The latin verſion of the *Roman* Church hath put, *Heaven muſt receive him*, as if when St. *Peter* ſaid theſe words, Chriſt was not yet aſcended. And it is falſe that Heaven doth receive Chriſt continually until the day of Judgment. The *Lovain* Doctors which have tranſlated the Bible into *French*, have acknowledged the ſame; wherefore they have turned faithfully, *Whom Heaven muſt contain*. And *Emanuel Sa* the Jeſuit, in his Notes upon this place, *Recipere, id eſt, receptum continere. To receive*, that is to ſay, *to contain him after he be received.* Chriſt then muſt be contained in Heaven, and not be ſtill upon Earth.

They rid themſelves as ill out of the other places. They ſay, that when Chriſt ſaith, *He leaveth the world, and is no more in the world*, it muſt be underſtood concerning his viſible preſence. So they make without the word of God, two ſorts of Chriſt's preſence, the one viſible, the other inviſible. And make Chriſt ſay, *I go away, but I will remain inviſible: I leave you, but my body ſhall be always with you.* Now in conſcience, could a man that had Chriſt's body and ſoul in his mouth, ſay that Chriſt is not preſent, under colour that he ſees him not? By the ſame reaſon one may ſay, that a man hath no ſoul, becauſe it is inviſible, and that a man hath left the town, when he lyeth hid in it.

What more? Chriſt himſelf in the 13 of St. *Mark*, 21 verſe, warns us that there will come a time in which they ſhall ſay unto us, *Lo here is Chriſt, or lo he is there*; and forbids us to believe it. And in the 24 Chapter of St. *Matthew*, he addeth: *If any man ſhall ſay unto you, he is in the cloſets or in the cup-boards*, for the *Greek word* ταμείοις, (ſignifieth that) *believe it not.* Truly he ſpeaketh evidently of the places wherein they ſhall ſay that Chriſt is hidden. And ſpeaketh in the plural

plural ἐν ταμείοις, *in cloſets*, as of a Chriſt which ſhall be thought to be in ſeveral places at once.

But Chriſt refuteth plainly all theſe ſhifts and evaſions of our Adverſaries, when as to comfort his Diſciples, ſorrowful for his departure, he promiſeth them to ſend them the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt. According to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, he ſhould have ſaid, ‡ *I go away, but that ſhall not hinder me from being preſent in your mouths, and in your ſtomachs, and I ſhall be more preſent unto you than I am now.* He ſaith not a word of all that unto them, but comforting them for his departure, he promiſeth them his holy Spirit.

St. *Paul* in the ſecond to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 5. 8. ſaith, *We are willing rather to be abſent from the body, and to be preſent with the Lord.* And to the *Philippians*, Chapter, 1. 23. *My deſire is to depart and to be with Chriſt.* Had this Apoſtle loſt his wits? For according to the Popiſh doctrine he ſhould have ſaid, *I am already with Chriſt, I do carry him in my hands, I have him in my ſtomach.*

St. *Auſtin* upon that, is very expreſs, in his 50 Treatiſe upon St. *John*, where he ſaith: *According to the Majeſty of the Lord, according to his unſpeakable and inviſible grace is accompliſh'd that which he ſaid, I will be with you at all times till the conſummation of the world. But according to his fleſh which the world hath taken, and as he is born of the Virgin, &c. he ſaid, Ye ſhall not have me always.* And in the firſt Treatiſe upon the firſt of *John*, § *We can no more handle him with our hands, now that he ſitteth in heaven, but well may we touch him by faith.* He ſpaketh to the Prieſts of theſe times, who brag to have Chriſt in their hands. And in the 78 Treatiſe upon St *John*, ‖ *Chriſt was going away as being a man, and withdrew not himſelf as he is God.* And in the 30 Treatiſe, * *The Lord's body in*

‡ John 14, 16, 26. & Chap. 15, 26. § Ipſum jam in cœlo ſedentem manu contrectare non poſſumus, ſed fide contingere. ‖ A quibus homo abſcedebat, Deus non recedebat.

* Corpus Domini in quo reſurrexit, in uno loco eſſe oportet, veritas ejus ubique diffuſa eſt.

which

which he is riſen, muſt be in one place only, but his truth is ſpread every where. There is in the Latin, *in uno loco eſſe oportet*, and not, *in uno loco eſſe poteſt*, according to the new editions falſified. ‡ *Gratian*, *Ivo Carnutenſis*, *Lombard*, *Thomas*, *Gabriel Biel*, and the old editions of St. *Auſtin* have *oportet*. Reaſon alſo requireth it. For it would be repugnant to common ſenſe to ſay, that *the body of Chriſt may be in one place*; as if one ſhould ſay, that the Sun may be in one place, it were to ſay that it may be in no place.

Cyril of *Alexandria* in his eleventh book upon St. *John*, Chap. 3, ‖ *Though he be abſent in body, appearing for us before his Father, and ſitting at his right hand, he dwelleth in his Saints through his Spirit.* He ſupplyeth the want of his corporal preſence by giving his Spirit, and not in keeping himſelf hidden under the accidents of bread.

The *Eutychian* Hereticks ſpake as our Adverſaries do. For they ſaid, that Chriſt's body is preſent on earth, as well as in heaven, by an inviſible preſence. Againſt whom, whither *Vigil*, or *Gelaſius* Pope hath written five Books, in the firſt whereof he ſpeaketh thus: § *The Son of God according to his humanity, hath left us, and withdrawn himſelf from us. But according to his divinity he ſaith unto us, I will be with you till the conſummation of the world.* And in the 4 Book: † *When Chriſt's fleſh was upon earth, it was not in Heaven, and now that it is in Heaven, it is not on earth.* Even as *Vigilius*, ſaying that when Chriſt's fleſh was upon earth, it was not in heaven, underſtood it was not in heaven neither viſibly nor inviſibly. So when he ſaith, that now it is no more on earth, he meaneth it is not there, neither viſibly nor inviſibly.

‡ Gratianus Diſt. 2. de Conſecr. Can. prim. Ivo 2. parte Decreti c. 18. Lombard lib. 4. Sentent. Diſt. 12. A. Thomas 3. parte ſummæ qu. 75. art. 1. Gabriel Biel Lect. 39. in Canonem Miſſæ. ‖ Etſi abeſt corpore, Patri pro nobis apparens ac à dextris ejus ſedens, habitat tamen in Sanctis per Spiritum. § Vigil. l. 1. Dei filius ſecundum humanitatem ſuam receſſit à nobis Secundum divinitatem ſuam ait nobis. Ecce ſum vobiſcum uſq; ad conſummationem ſæculi. † Lib. 4. Quando in terra fuit, non erat utiq; in cœlo: et nunc quia in cælo eſt, non eſt utiqes in terra.

That

That if he meant or underſtood that Chriſt's fleſh is preſent unto us invifibly, then would he plead the *Eutychians* cauſe, for that was their opinion.

To be ſhort, the Apoſtle to the *Epheſians*, Chap. 3. 17. ſaith, *that Chriſt dwelleth in our hearts by faith*, and not in our ſtomachs in the midſt of meat.

When we aſk of them after what manner the body of Chriſt is preſent in the Sacrament, they anſwer, that it is not preſent there circumſcriptively, as wine is encloſed in a tun or caſk, nor definitively, as immaterial ſpirits: But that it is Sacramentally preſent. This anſwer truly is ridiculous. For, to ſay that Chriſt is in the Sacrament ſacramentally preſent, is a thing as abſurd as to ſay that a man which is in a temple, is there templarily preſent, and he that is in a coach, is preſent in it coacharily. Moreover, it is certain that by this anſwer, they come to be of our ſide. For they ſay themſelves that this word *Sacrament*, ſignifieth a *ſacred ſign*. Therefore to be preſent ſacramentally, ſignifieth no other thing, but to be preſent ſignificatively, and by figure and repreſentation.

CHAP. XIV. *Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, acknowledging that Tranſubſtantiation is not grounded in the Scriptures: That the Primitive Church did conſecrate by the prayer, and not by theſe words*, This is my body.

THE moſt learned of the *Roman* Church ground their *Tranſubſtantiation* not upon theſe words, *This is my body*, but upon the authority of the Church of *Rome*, which, as they hold, cannot err.

Scotus, which is termed the ſubtile Doctor, upon the fourth of the Sentences *Diſt.* 11. *queſt.* 3. ſaith: *There is no place to be found in the Scripture, that may without the determination of the Church, compel a man to believe the Tranſubſtantiation.* Upon which place, Cardinal *Bellarmine* in his 3 book of the Euchariſt Chap.

Chap. 23, ſpaketh thus: ‡ Doctor *Scotus ſaith, that there is no place in the Scripture ſo expreſs, as to compel evidently without the declaration of the Church, to receive the Tranſubſtantiation. And that is not altogether improbable. For although the Scripture that we have alledged, ſeem to us ſo plain that it may compel a man not proud or inſolent, yet neverthelesſ it may juſtly be doubted whether it be ſo or no, ſeeing the moſt acute and learned men, ſuch eſpecially as* Scotus *was, are of a contrary opinion.* And in the ſame place he tells us, that *Scotus* ſaith, that *Tranſubſtantiation* was not an article of faith before the Council of *Lateran*, held *Anno* 1215.

For that cauſe *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit upon the 3 part of *Thomas*, Diſp. 180. Chap. 5. having repreſented the opinion of *Scotus*, who ſaith, § that *the truth of the words of Conſecration might have been preſerved, though the ſubſtance of the bread and wine had remained in the Euchariſt*, (to whom alſo *Durand* joyneth himſelf) blameth *Bellarmine* without naming him, for ſaying, that *the opinion of Scotus is probable*, and accuſeth him of halting on both ſides. *We ſee* * (ſaith he) *certain profeſſors in Divinity in our times, who halting a little on both ſides, do not eſteem improbable that which* Scotus *hath ſaid touching the words of Conſecration.*

Of that number of learned and acute men, was Cardinal *Cajeton*, who in his notes upon *Thomas*, ſpeak-

‡ Secundo dicit non extare locum ullum Scripturæ tam expreſſum, ut ſine declaratione Eccleſiæ evidenter cogat Tranſubſtantiationem admittere. Et id non eſt omnino improbabile. Nam etſi Scriptura quam nos ſuprà adduximus, videatur nobis tam clara, ut poſſit cogere hominem non protervum: Tamen an ita ſit merito dubitari poteſt, cum homines doctiſſimi & acuratiſſimi, qualis imprimis Scotus fuit, contrarium ſentiant.

§ Scotus docet potuiſſe ſervari veritatem verborum conſecrationis, etiamſi in Euchariſtia maneret ſubſtantia panis & vini.

* Videas aliquos Theologiæ Profeſſores noſtri temporis qui in utramque partem aliquantulum claudicantes non putant improbabile id quod Scotus de verbis conſecrationis dixit.

eth

eth thus: § *The other point which the Goſpel expoundeth not expreſly, we have received it from the Church, to wit, the converſion of the bread into the body of Chriſt.*

Item. Converſio non explicatè habetur in Evangelio. *The converſion* (of the bread) *is not to be found explicitly in the Goſpel.*

The Cardinal *de Alliaco*, † *It appears that this manner which ſuppoſeth that the ſubſtance of bread remains ſtill, is poſſible, neither is it contrary to reaſon, nor to the authority of the Bible, but is more eaſy to conceive, and more reaſonable.* And for this cauſe he is checked by *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit in the 2 Tome upon the 3 part of *Thomas*, Diſp. 180. Chap. 5. And in that ſame place he ſaith that *Durand* followed the opinion of *Scotus* upon the 4. of the *Sentences*, *Diſp.* 11 *queſt.* 2.

Gabriel Biel in the 40 leſſon upon the Canon of the Maſs: *How the body of Chriſt is there, whether it be by converſion of ſomething into it, or whether without converſion Chriſt's body begins to be there with the bread, the ſubſtance and the accidents remaining, it is not expreſſed in the Canon of the Bible.* And even there: *That hath been proved by the authority of the Church and of the Saints, for that cannot be proved by reaſon.*

The ſame in the 41 leſſon aſketh, *why the Saints and the Church have choſen to ſay and determine that that ſhould be underſtood in ſo difficult a manner; ſeeing the Scriptures may be expounded and kept in their ſoundneſs, in a manner eaſy to be underſtood.* To this he anſwereth, that *the Church hath determined it ſo*, mean-

§ Cajetanus in 3. Thomæ q. 75. art. 1. Alterum quod Evangelium non explicavit expreſſe, ab Eccleſia accipimus, ſcil. converſionem panis in corpus Chriſti.

† Petr. de Alliaco in 4. Sent. q. 6. art. 2. Patet quod ille modus eſt poſſibilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec authoritati Bibliæ: immo eſt facilior ad intelligendum, & rationabilior quàm aliquis aliorum.

ing

ing by the Church, not the *Syrian*, nor the *Greek* or *Ethiopian*, but the *Roman* Church only.

Salmeron the Jeſuit in the thirteenth Treatiſe of the ninth Tome, expounding theſe words *This is my body*, ſpeaketh thus: *Certainly theſe words do not ſignify that any converſion be made, by the force of the words. Otherwiſe he that ſhould ſay this is my body, in ſhewing his own body, would ſignify that ſomething is converted into his body.* And he inſiſts very much upon this, that theſe words *This is my body*, are declarative or ſignificative of the thing which is, and not effective of that which is not.

Wherefore the ſame Jeſuit, in the ſame Treatiſe, joins himſelf to the opinion of Pope *Innocent* the third, † who in the fourth book of the Myſteries of the Maſs Chapters 6, and 17, teacheth that Chriſt made not the converſion of the bread by theſe words *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, but by his divine power, and by the bleſſing that had preceded. For he will have the pronouncing of theſe words to have another vertue at this day in the mouths of Prieſts, than they had in the mouth of Chriſt. Which opinion of *Innocent* the third, is followed by *Innocent* the fourth, his Succeſſor, and by multitudes of Doctors, which *Salmeron* produceth ‡ in the ſame Treatiſe.

It is credible that theſe Popes and Doctors were moved to teach that Chriſt did not conſecrate by theſe words, *This is my body*, but by the prayer of bleſſing he made before, becauſe the Fathers ſay the ſame, and that ſuch was the belief of the antient Church. *Juſtin Martyr* * calleth that which we receive in the Eu-

† Inno. 3. Lib. 4. de Myſter. Miſſæ cap. 6. Sane dici poteſt quod Chriſtus virtute divina confecit, & poſtea formam expreſſit, &c. Et cap. 17. Ab hujus quæſtonis laqueo facile ſe abſolvit qui dicit, quod Chriſtus tunc confecit cum benedicit.

‡ §. Porro pag. 82.

* Τὴν δὶ εὐχῆς τῦ λόγυ παρ' αὐτῦ εὐχαριςηθεῖσαν τροφήν.

chariſt

chariſt *a food conſecrated by the prayer of the Word*, that is to ſay Chriſt. St. *Auſtin* in the third book of the Trinity, Chapter 4. ſpeaking of that which we receive in the Sacrament, ſaith that *it is taken of the fruits of the earth, & prece myſtica conſecratum, and is conſecrated by the myſtical prayer.* *Origen* in his eighth book againſt *Celſus*: † *We eat loaves of bread which by the prayer are made one body, which is ſome holy thing.* *Ireneus* in his fourth book, Chapter 34. ‖ *The bread receiving the invocation of God is no more common bread, but Euchariſt.* *Baſil* in the firſt book of the holy Ghoſt, 27 Chapter, calleth the words of conſecration τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα, *the words of invocation.* *Iſidorus* in the ſixth book of *Origines*, in the Chapter *de Officiis*: ‡ *The Sacrifice is ſo called, as if one ſhould ſay a ſacred deed, becauſe it is conſecrated by the myſtical prayer in remembrance of the Paſſion which the Lord ſuffered for us.* Yet at this day the *Greek* Churches conſecrated by the prayer, as *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth in the fourth Book of the Euchariſt, Chapter 12. § See the Canon *Corpus* in the ſecond diſtinction of the conſecration.

By this it is as clear as the light, that the antient Fathers did not believe that by theſe words *This is my body*, any converſion of the bread was made.

CHAP. XV. *Of the Adoration of the Sacrament. The opinion of the* Roman *Church.*

THE *Roman* Church having deified the Sacrament, hath conſequently obliged herſelf to worſhip it with the higheſt adoration which is due to God alone. By this means a wafer of bread hath taken God's place, and is called God and is worſhipped as God. They ſpake of lifting up God in the Maſs, and

† Ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν σῶμα γινομένους δι' εὐχὴν ἁγίου τινός.

‖ Qui eſt à terra panis percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non eſt panis communis, ſed Euchariſtia.

‡ Sacrificium dictum quaſi ſacrum factum, quia prece myſtica conſecratur in memoriam pro nobis dominicæ paſſionis.

§ Habemus.

of

of God's feaſt (*viz. Corpus Chriſti* day) and of carrying God to a ſick body. Phraſes that are not to be found in the holy Scriptures, and unheard of in the antient Chriſtian Church.

The Council of *Trent* in the thirteenth Seſſion, Chapter 5. ſpeaketh thus: ‖ *There remains no doubt but that all faithful Chriſtian People ought to give the worſhip of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this holy Sacrament in the veneration.* Now by this word *Sacrament*, they underſtand the body of Chriſt with the *ſpecies* or accidents. For by this word *Sacrament*, our Adverſaries never underſtand Chriſt Jeſus out of the *ſpecies*. This Council then ordaineth that the *ſpecies* of the bread and wine ſhall be worſhipped with ſovereign adoration.

The practice doth verify what I ſay. For the People worſhipping the conſecrated hoſt, divide not their mind into two Adorations, and worſhip not the body of Chriſt with one kind of Adoration, and the *ſpecies* of the bread with another; but carry their whole devotion to worſhip with ſovereign adoration, the hoſt they have before their eyes.

Bellarmin teacheth as much in his fourth Book of the Euchariſt, Chapter 29. ‡ *We ſay that Chriſt, Per ſe & proprie, is to be worſhipped with the adoration of Latria, and that this adoration belongeth alſo to the ſigns or ſymbols of the bread and wine, in as much as they are conceived or conſidered, as being one with Chriſt himſelf, whom they contain.* And faith, it was juſt ſo that Chriſt's garments were worſhipped with the ſame adoration that Chriſt was. For (ſaith he) they did not pull off his cloaths for to worſhip him.

For he propoſeth this for an infallible maxim,

‖ Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Chriſti fideles latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic ſanctiſſimo Sacramento in veneratione adhibeant.

‡ §. Sed hæc. Cultu latriæ dicimus per ſe & proprie Chriſtum eſſe adorandum, & eam adorationem ad ſymbola etiam panis & vini pertinere, quatenus apprehenduntur ut quid unum cum ipſo Chriſto quem continent.

that ‖ *he that worſhippeth ſome thing, worſhippeth alſo all the things that are conjoined to it*. That is to ſay that he that worſhippeth the Images, worſhips alſo the Cobwebs that are upon them: And he that worſhippeth the Pope, worſhippeth alſo his Breeches and his ſhirt. He will have then the roundneſs, whiteneſs, length, breadth, and taſte of the hoſt, to be worſhipped with the ſame adoration that God is worſhipped with, becauſe theſe accidents and Chriſt are but one.

Vaſquez the Jeſuit ſaith the ſame, in his ſecond book of *Adoration*, Diſp. 9. Chapter 1. ‡ *Chriſt's humanity* (ſaith he) *and the Euchariſt are worſhipped abſolutely with the adoration of Latria, albeit that being conjoined by accident with the God-head, a worſhip is given to them.* And that we may know that the accidents of the bread, that is to ſay the breadth, length, colour and ſavour of the bread are worſhipped with the ſame adoration that Chriſt is worſhipped: He addeth, § *the accidents of the bread and wine, becauſe they exiſt not by their proper exiſtence, but by the exiſtence of the body and blood of Chriſt, may very well receive the ſame honour of adoration together with the body and blood of Chriſt: Even as Chriſt's humanity and divinity are worſhipped with one and the ſame motion of adoration.*

This Idolatry is prodigious, by which the colour and roundneſs of the bread are worſhipped with the ſame adoration that God is worſhipped with. The *Ægyptians* did ſeem to have attained to the higheſt degree of Idolatry when they did worſhip *Cats, Onions*, and *Storks*. But this Idolatry, in worſhipping the accidents of the bread, goes far beyond them: For theſe things

---

‖ Bell. lib. de Imaginibus cap. 25. Qui adorat aliquem, adorat ea omnia quæ cum ipſo conjuncta ſunt.

‡ Quæ abſolute dicuntur adorari adoratione latriæ, cum tamen per accidens cum divinitate conjuncta colantur.

§ Accidentia panis & vini cum exiſtant non propria exiſtentia ſed exiſtentia corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, optime poſſunt ſimul ſub eundem cultum adorationis cadere, quemadmodum humanitas Chriſti ejuſque divinitas eodem motu adorationis coluntur.

they

they worſhipped, were ſubſtances and things really exiſting: But theſe accidents without a ſubject, are imaginary things, and which indeed are nothing. The folly of thoſe *Ægyptians* would have been much greater, if they had worſhipped the colour and the length, and the faces or lowring of a Cat, without worſhipping the Cat. Add moreover that they did not worſhip beaſts and plants as the Sovereign God: But as having in them ſome ſparks of the Divinity. But the *Roman* Church worſhippeth the accidents of bread without bread, with a Sovereign adoration, and which only belongeth to God.

And mark the Doctrine of this Jeſuit, who ſaith with approbation of the Examinators prefixed in the fore-front of his book, that the accidents of the bread do exiſt in Chriſt after the ſame manner as the humanity of Chriſt hath no proper ſubſiſtence, but ſubſiſteth in the divine nature. This truly is to unite and conjoin the roundneſs and colour of the bread with Chriſt with a perſonal union.

And as errors are link'd together and cleave one to another, it is certain that the accidents of the bread are not more ſtraitly conjoined with Chriſt, than Chriſt with theſe accidents. And by conſequent even as becauſe of this imaginary union of the body of Chriſt with the accidents of the bread, the things which befal theſe accidents, are alſo attributed unto the body of Chriſt, of which they ſay, it is carried, and lifted up, and walked up and down, and ſtolen away, and eaten by mice, and vomited up, and devoured by a beaſt: So by the ſame reaſon becauſe of the ſame union, they muſt ſay that the roundneſs and whiteneſs of the bread are the Son of God, and are born of the Virgin, and are juſt and without original Sin.

In all this truly the *Roman* Church ſheweth herſelf idolatrous in the laſt degree. It is a bog or quagmire of abuſes, and an *abyſſus* or a gulf of ſeduction wherein *Satan* hath plunged men: God puniſhing in his juſt anger the contempt of his word, which is become an unknown Book among the People. For it is juſt that

thoſe that have loſt Piety, ſhould loſe alſo the common ſenſe.

CHAP. XVI. *Examen of the Adoration of the Sacrament by the word of God. That the Antient Chriſtians did not worſhip the Sacrament.*

IF the Scriptures had with our Adverſaries any authority, this controverſy would ſoon be decided.

Every action that concerns God's ſervice, and eſpecially Adoration, is to be done in Faith, and not with doubts and conjectures, as St. *James* ſaith, Chapter firſt: *Let him aſk in faith nothing wavering*: And St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 14. ſaith, *that whatſoever is not of faith, is ſin.* And the ſame Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 11. *It is impoſſible without faith to pleaſe God.* Now it is impoſſible that the people of the *Roman* Church ſhould worſhip the *hoſt* of the Maſs in faith: Becauſe God hath not commanded it in his word. For as St. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 10. *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*

In general we have the Lord's commandment ſaying, *thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* He ſpeaketh of the Sovereign God, Creator and Governor of the World, and not of a God made with words, that is made of bread, ſubject to falling, to be vomited up, and ſtolen away. Certainly, to worſhip ſuch a god as that, is to violate the commandment of the law, which ſaith: *Thou ſhalt have no other God before me.*

In vain do they anſwer that Chriſt ought to be worſhipped, ſince he is God: For, beſides that they preſuppoſe that which is not, to wit, That this bread is tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt, they declare themſelves that in this Sacrament Chriſt's body is not only worſhipped; but alſo the roundneſs, colour, and ſavour of the bread.

That if any religious worſhip were to be given to this Sacrament, ſome trace of it would be found in the inſtitution of the holy Supper, and ſome commandment of the Lord: But neither trace nor appearance

of

of that is to be found. But rather we ſee that the Apoſtles ſat at the table during this action, as it appeareth by what is ſaid in St. *John* 13. 12. that Chriſt *after he had taken his garments, he ſat down again.* During which repaſt St. *John* was leaning on Jeſus's boſom, *Verſe* 23. And St. *Paul* relating the inſtitution of the Lord, ſaith: *I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you.* Since then he doth not ſpeak of any adoration of the Sacrament, it is certain he had not received it of the Lord, and believed not that the Church was obliged to worſhip the Sacrament.

The ordinary ſhift of our Adverſaries, is to ſay that the Apoſtles worſhipped not the conſecrated hoſt, becauſe they had Chriſt every day with them, and muſt have been continually kneeling before him.

I anſwer, that to eat Chriſt with their teeth, and receive him in their mouths, and ſacrifice him in ſacrifice propitiatory, are actions which were new to the Apoſtles, and which neceſſarily required adoration. Every Sacrifice is performed in the worſhipping of him to whom the ſacrifice is offered up. Theſe things ſo extraordinary and admirable (if they were true) did well deſerve an extraordinary veneration. Eſpecially in the firſt inſtitution which was to ſerve for a rule unto the Church, and a pattern to conform herſelf unto.

And ſince our Adverſaries will have Chriſt in the holy ſupper to have eaten himſelf, he might by the ſame reaſon worſhip himſelf, and bow the knee before himſelf, which is a very merry and recreative conception, and ſuitable unto Tranſubſtantiation.

Whereupon we give our Adverſaries the choice. Will they have Chriſt to have adored the conſecrated hoſt? But it would follow from thence, according to their doctrine, that Chriſt had worſhipped himſelf, and that he was holier than himſelf. And it is certain that he that worſhips, and he that is worſhipped, are two perſons. Will they have Chriſt not to have worſhipped the conſecrated hoſt? But it will follow from thence that the Apoſtles, neither then, nor ſince,

never worſhipped it. For Chriſt ſaying unto them, *Do this*, commanded them to do as he had done.

That if the Lord would have had the Apoſtles to have worſhipped the ſacrament he would have made an elevation of the hoſt, as was obſerved in all ſacrifices, for to bind the ſacrificers and the aſſiſtants to the adoration. A thing nevertheleſs which Chriſt did not do: For he offered up nothing to his Father. He did not ſay, *Father receive this oblation:* But ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Take, Eat.*

Even in the very time of *Tertullian* and of *Cyprian* (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) the cuſtom of divers Chriſtians, both men and women, was to carry into their houſes the ſacred bread they had received in the Church, to wrap it up in a cloth, and to lock it up at home in a cheſt or cupboard. A manifeſt proof they worſhipped not the ſacrament. For would they have permitted a woman to take God with her hand, put him up in her pocket, and keep him locked up cloſe at home?

§ Would the Chriſtians have upbraided the Pagans that they worſhipped Statues that could not move themſelves, nor riſe when they were fallen, nor breathe, ſubject to ruſt, wherein mice make their neſts, &c. If the Pagans might have upbraided them the ſame, and tell them that they worſhipped an hoſt that could not breathe, nor riſe up when it is fallen, nor open its eyes, nor ſtretch out its hands; that may be ſtolen by men, and eaten by mice, and will grow mouldy, *&c.*

Durſt *Theodoret* have ſaid in the 55 queſtion upon *Geneſis*, * that *it is an extreme folly to worſhip that which one eateth*, if the Chriſtians of his time had worſhipped the ſacrament before they eat it? It is this error above all others that keeps the Pagans from embracing the Chriſtian Religion, as *Averroes* teſtifieth; of whom *Salmeron* the Jeſuit cites theſe words out of

§ See Arnob. lib. 6. and Lactantius lib. 2. cap. 2.

* ἀβελτηρίας ἰσχάτης τὸ ἐσθιόμενον προσκυνεῖν.

the

the 12th book of his *Metaphyſicks*. § *Quoniam Chriſtiani Deum ſuum quem adorant, manducant; ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis. Since Chriſtians eat the God they worſhip, let my ſoul be with the Philoſophers.*

The antienteſt form of celebrating the Euchariſt in the Chriſtian Church, is that which is deſcribed about the latter end of the ſecond Apology of *Juſtin Martyr*, wherein no mention is made of any adoration: No more than in that which is extant in the book of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy* of *Denis*, who is ſurnamed *Areopagite*.

There are ſome places in the Fathers that ſay that Chriſt is worſhipped in the Euchariſt: But that makes nothing to this purpoſe. For the Father alſo and the Holy Ghoſt ought to be worſhipped in the Euchariſt. It is one thing to worſhip Chriſt in the action of the Sacrament, and another thing to worſhip the Sacrament. Yet notwithſtanding, the third Council of *Carthage* in the 23 Canon, forbids one to addreſs his prayer to the Son in the Euchariſt, in theſe words: ‡ *When any one aſſiſts at the Altar, let his prayer always be directed to the Father.* If then they had worſhipped the conſecrated hoſt, doubtleſs it would not have been forbidden to invocate it.

There be alſo in antient Fathers ſome oratoric Apoſtropho's, wherein they ſpeak to the ‖ water of Baptiſm, and to the bread and wine of the Euchariſt; but that makes nothing for the adoration neither of the water nor of the bread. So the ſcripture ſpeaks often to heaven, to the Earth, to the Sea, to the Mountains; yet none can infer from thence that they muſt be worſhipped.

Of *Theodoret*, who in his 2d Dialogue ſaith, that the ſigns are worſhipped, ſhall be ſpoken hereafter. There is in the *Greek* προσκυνῆται, which cannot be underſtood of the ſovereign adoration, ſeeing he ſpeaks of the ſigns or ſymbols, which cannot be worſhip-

§ Salmeron Tomo 9. Tract. 18. §. Calvinus.

‡ Cum ad altare aſſiſtitur, ſemper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.

‖ Ambroſ. in Lucam cap. 10. O aqua quæ Sacramentum Chriſti eſſe meruiſti.

ped religiouſly, and with the worſhip of *Latria*, without manifeſt Idolatry. In the *Greek* copies of the *African codex*, *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, is often called προσκυνητὸς: *Abraham* worſhippeth, or rather proſtrateth himſelf before the Sons of *Heth*, *Geneſ.* 23. verſe 7, & 12. And *Jacob* doth the ſame to his brother *Eſau*, *Gen.* 33. 3. and *David* to *Jonathan*, 1 *Sam.* 20. 41. Whom nevertheleſs *Abraham*, and *Jacob*, and *David* eſteemed not to be Gods: *Tertullian* againſt *Hermogenes*, Chap. 22, ſaith, that he worſhippeth the plenitude of the Scriptures. *Auſtin* in the 164 Epiſtle to *Emeritus*, *Baptiſmum Chriſti ubique veneramur: We worſhip every where the Baptiſm of Chriſt.* Such manner of ſpeeches ought to be underſtood according to the ſubject or matter in hand.

CHAP. XVII. *Of the Prieſts intention, without which the* Roman *Church believes no conſecration nor Tranſubſtantiation is made.*

THE *Roman* Church holdeth, that if the Prieſt hath not intention to conſecrate, and to do what the Church doth, there is no conſecration or Tranſubſtantiation made. It is thus defined and determined by Pope *Eugenius* the 4th, in the inſtruction of the *Armenians*, which is at the end of the Council of *Florence*: And by the Council of *Trent* in the 7th Seſſion, Canon 11. in theſe words: * *If any one ſay that the intention to do at leaſt what the Church doth, is not requiſite in the Miniſters, let him be accurſed.*

The Sacrament then being of no value, if the Prieſt's intention be not to conſecrate, it is impoſſible for the people to be aſſured that the conſecration was made. For they know not what the intention and thought of the Prieſt was: only they preſume it by conjecture. *God only knows the hearts of men*, 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. The adoration therefore of the Hoſt, is a conjectural

* Si quis dixerit in Miniſtris dum Sacramenta conficiunt, & conferunt, non requiri intentionem, ſaltem faciendi quod Eccleſia facit, anathema ſit.

adoration,

adoration, and which is done at all adventure, ſince no man is aſſured of the Prieſt's intention, without which the Sacrament is of no value. *Bellarmin* confeſſes it ingenuouſly in his third Book of *Juſtification*, chap. 8. * *No man* (ſaith he) *can be certain by the certitude of faith that he receives a true Sacrament, becauſe it depends upon the intention of the Miniſter: And none can ſee another man's intention.* And truly this Cardinal hath reaſon to ſay that none can be certain of it: for there are Prieſts that are Magicians, and there are examples of Prieſts convicted and puniſhed for having conſecrated in the name of the Devil. Even very lately there was one put to death at *Loudun*, accuſed of *Magick* by the *Urſulina* Nuns that were poſſeſt with the Devil. There be Prieſts, Atheiſts and profane, that ſcoff and jeſt at every thing they do in the Church. I have known divers Prieſts, who being converted to the true Religion, did confeſs to have ſung Maſſes for many years together againſt their intention, and deteſting in their hearts what they did, and aſked forgiveneſs of God for that they had fought ſo long againſt their own conſciences. In all theſe Maſſes then no conſecration was made.

By the ſame doctrine it appears that the Prieſt doth not know whether he be a Prieſt or no. For he knows not what the intention of his Ordinator was. Whence followeth that all the Maſſes he ſings, and all the abſolutions he giveth, remain in ſuſpence, and no man knows whether they be of any force or value. Peradventure this Prieſt received the order of Prieſthood of a Biſhop that had intention, but this Biſhop perhaps received his Orders of another Biſhop that had no intention. And ſo mounting upwards, the uncertainty encreaſeth and multiplies itſelf *ad infinitum*. *Gabriel Biel* acknowledges the ſame in his Epitomy of the Ca-

* Dicent. Neque poteſt quis eſſe certus certitudine fidei ſe percipere verum Sacramentum, cum Sacramentum non conficiatur ſine intentione Miniſtri, & intentionem alterius nemo videre poſſit.

non of the Maſs: † *No Prieſt* (ſaith he) *that celebrateth, can know evidently whether he be a Prieſt: for he cannot know evidently whether he be baptized, or whether he hath received the Ordination lawfully.*

The Church then under the Old Teſtament had a great advantage over the Chriſtian Church: for then the Salvation of Children depended not upon the intention of thoſe that circumciſed them, but on the only grace of God, and upon his Covenant, which is a ſtay infinitely more firm than the intention of men.

Pope *Adrian* the 6. § after the Council of *Conſtance*, excuſeth the ſimple people that worſhippeth the unconſecrated Hoſt, which they think to be conſecrated, ſaying, the Hoſt is not worſhipped but with this condition, to wit, if the conſecration be made as it ought, in ſaying, *Adoro te ſi tu es Chriſtus: I worſhip thee if thou be Chriſt.* As ſaying: *I know not whether thou be Chriſt, or whether thou be not Chriſt; but howſoever and at all adventure, I adore thee if thou be Chriſt.*

Gerſon in his Treatiſe of the *Examen of Doctrines, Tome* 1. moves an objection drawn out of *Bonaventure*, touching the worſhipping of the Eucharift which is thought to be conſecrated though it be not. His anſwer after *Bonaventure* is ſuch: ‖ *It is an ordinary caſe which always carries this condition or implicit preſuppoſition, that the Prieſt hath done as ought to be done in the Church, which condition needs not to be expreſſed in the adoration. Neverthelefs this adoration frees itſelf from being a Sin, becauſe it is the cuſtom of the faithful: whereof we have an example in the worſhipping*

---

† Nullus celebrans poteſt evidenter ſcire ſe eſſe Sacerdotem, quia non poteſt evidenter ſcire ſe fore baptizatum, aut legitime ordinatum. § Adrian. 6. Quodlib. Sect. 10. Suppoſito 2. Fol. 70. Conſilium Conſtantienſe excuſat ſimplices adorantes hoſtiam non conſecratam, quia tacite implicatur conditio, ſi conſecratio ſit recte facta. Et paulo poſt, Si ſic adoret, Adoro te ſi tu es Chriſtus. Conſideration. 6. ‖ Objicit idem Bonaventura de adoratione Euchariſtiæ quandoque non conſecratæ in manibus Sacerdotis, Reſpondet caſum communem eſſe, qui ſemper implicitam habet conditionem vel preſuppoſitionem, quod Sacerdos fecerit ſecundum debitum Eccleſiæ ritum.

of

of Images. Theſe Doctors will have the Hoſt and Images of Saints to be worſhipped upon theſe conditions, *viz.* if the conſecration was duly made, and if thoſe Images be Images of true Saints, and if thoſe Saints hear us: Which be things that one muſt gueſs at piouſly, and be contented with conjectures, and be ſaved by cuſtom. As if a wife doubting whether he that hath lien with her, were her huſband or no, ſhould ſay unto him, *I have received you, but under this preſuppoſition, that you are my huſband: I have indeed lien with you, but it was under this condition, if you were my huſband.* The faith of the faithful is not grounded upon conjectures, it worſhips not a conjectural God, not knowing whether he be a God or no God.

The force of this intention is ſo great, that *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit ſaith, † *It is moſt certain that the power of conſecrating was committed unto Prieſts, ſo that if they would conſecrate to a bad uſe,* viz. *as for poyſonings, or enchantments, the conſecration nevertheleſs ſhould have its effect.* By this means Chriſt ſhall be in the power of a Magician, and ſhall become the ſport or paſtime of the Devil. Would God have given unto Prieſts a power againſt God himſelf, which he will not take from them when they employ it in the ſervice of the Devil?

But upon this intention mens conſciences are marvelouſly confounded and troubled, and their Doctors know not at what paſs they be. For if a Prieſt hath before him a great houſhold-loaf, and his intention is but to conſecrate one half of it, without cutting it into two pieces: how ſhall a man diſcern Chriſt's body which is in that bread, from the unconſecrated bread? And if the Prieſt hath before him a dozen of wafer cakes, and his intention is but to conſecrate ten of

† Vaſquez in 3 part. Thomæ Tomo 3. Diſp. 171. num. 17. Conſtat Sacerdotibus commiſſam fuiſſe poteſtatem conſecrandi, ita ut ſi vellent conſecrare in malum uſum, nempe pro veneficiis & incantationibus conſecratio eorum effectum haberet.

them,

them, if theſe Hoſts come to be mingled together, how ſhall he diſcern the conſecrated ones from thoſe that are not conſecrated? How ſhall he diſcern his God from the wafers of common bread? Is it poſſible that Chriſt did not leave unto Chriſtians any means to know with certainty whether his body be preſent under the *ſpecies*, or whether it be not: leſt they ſhould pollute themſelves with Idolatry.

Upon this adoration it muſt be obſerved, that the Council of *Trent* * ordaineth that the Sacrament be worſhipped. Now all the Doctors with an unanimous conſent, after Saint *Auſtin*, define that this word Sacrament ſignifieth a *ſacred ſign*. This Council then ordains that the ſign be worſhipped. That if by the *ſacred ſign* Chriſt himſelf muſt be underſtood, Chriſt ſhall be the ſign and the figure of himſelf, as *Bellarmin* § ſaith in the 24. chapter of his ſecond Book of the *Euchariſt*: ‖ *The ſame Chriſt was the figure of himſelf.*

In this point of adoration, God in his juſt judgment hath given our adverſaries over into a reprobate ſenſe. For when the hoſt is fallen into ſome filthy place, or is vomited up through drunkenneſs, they worſhip it thus defiled, as *Vaſquez* teaches in his 3 Tome, upon the 3 part of *Thomas*, *Diſput.* 195. *chap.* 5. † *That is* (ſaith he) *the common opinion of the Church, which would worſhip as a true Sacrament the ſpecies taken out of a filthy place, or vomited up again by a brute beaſt: for there is no reaſon to ſay that Chriſt's body ceaſeth to be under them before they be corrupted.* And in the ſame †† place he teacheth, that if a dumb creature hath eaten the conſecrated Hoſts, and drunk the conſecrated cup, this beaſt ſhall grow fat with them, and may be made drunk with it, and its belly

* Seſſ. 22. cap. 5. § Producunt. ‖ Idem Chriſtus, ſui ipſius figura fuit. † Vaſq. 3. Tom in 3. partem Thomæ Diſp. 195. cap. 5. Hoc eſt contra communem ſenſum Eccleſiæ, quæ ſpecies è loco ſordido erutas tanquam verum Sacramentum veneraretur. †† Cap. 43.

ſhall

ſhall ſwell. It will then be drunk with accidents, and fatten with roundneſſes and lines.

The words of this Jeſuit, in the beginning of the 4 chapter of the ſame Diſpute, are ſuch; ‡ *It may come to paſs that a beaſt that hath eaten the ſpecies of the Sacrament, ſhall not be leſs nouriſhed with them than if it had eaten bread and wine not conſecrated: yea it may fall out that this beaſt may be made drunk therewith, and her belly ſtretch and ſwell.* To be ſhort, by this doctrine that beaſt may burſt for having eaten God.

For to avoid this ignominy and preſerve Chriſt from theſe inconveniencies, certain Doctors of the *Roman* Church, and namely *Bonaventure* have eſteemed that ſo ſoon as a beaſt hath devoured the conſecrated Hoſt, or that it hath been caſt into the dirt or in a privy, Chriſt's body withdraws himſelf, and the ſubſtance of the bread returns by a ſecond tranſubſtantiation no leſs admirable than the firſt. But Pope § *Gregory* the eleventh in his *Directory* of Inquiſitors, part. 2. queſt. 20. condemns this opinion: and that conformably to the opinion of *Thomas*, and of *Scotus*, and of the *Jeſuits*, who hold generally that the body of Chriſt is taken really by a beaſt, and that mice may carry it away.

CHAP. XVIII. *That our Adverſaries in this matter intangle themſelves into abſurdities, and inſoluble contradictions.*

IT is hard to believe a man that believes not himſelf, and that contradicts himſelf, and heaps up together ſo many abſurdities, that it ſeems he is

‡ Accedere poteſt ut animal quod ſpecies Sacramenti ſumpſit, non minus nutriatur quàm ſi panem & vinum non conſecratum manducet. Immo etiam accidere poteſt ut animal inebrietur, & venter ejus diſtendatur. Vaſquez. in 3 part. Thomæ Diſp. 195. cap. 5. § Verum Greg. 11. in Directorio Inquiſitorum 2. p. 4. 10. damnavit aſſerentes ſub hoſtia conſeciata, projecta in lutum, aut locum ſordidum, non manere corpus Chriſti.

afraid

afraid other men ſhould believe him. This maxim is true without exception, that two things contradictory cannot both be true. Our Adverſaries themſelves confeſs that it paſſeth the Omnipotency of God, and that he cannot do that a thing be and be not at one and the ſame time: that *Cæſar* be a man indeed and not be a reaſonable creature. That a round figure be ſquare whilſt it is round.

Againſt this rule do our adverſaries offend, deſtroying the definition of things, and affirming things which are incompatible, and heaping together in this matter a thouſand abſurdities, whereof we will ſpecify ſome.

1. They ſay that in the Maſs the Prieſt with 5 words makes the body of Chriſt, which nevertheleſs was already before the Prieſt made it. They ſpeak as if I ſhould ſay, that whilſt *Philip* is at *Paris*, ſome body makes him at *Rome*. To make a thing which is already, and to deſtroy a thing which is not, are like abſurdities.

2. If a man be in this chamber who was not in it the day before, it muſt needs follow that either he came thither from elſewhere, or was born in it. But in the Maſs they ſay that Chriſt is not there before the conſecration, and that after the conſecration he is there, and yet that he came not thither: It follows then that he was born there, or freſhly formed, though he was already before.

3. They ſay that the *Species* of the bread and wine (for they ſpeak after that manner) contain the body of Chriſt, and yet contain it not, for it is in heaven. This is a ridiculous contradiction, to will that a body be out of that which contains it, for thence will follow that the thing which containeth it, contains it not.

4. They ſay that the Lord's body with all its bigneſs and length is contained in the leaſt crum of the Hoſt, and in the leaſt drop of the chalice, ſo that if the point of a pin were dipt in the conſecrated cup, the Lord's body would be whole in that drop that ſhould hang at the end of the pin. Whence followeth that the

the contained is greater than the continent, as if one ſhould ſay that a crown which is in a purſe, is bigger than the purſe, and that the Earth is bigger than heaven that compaſſeth it about.

5. They give to the body of Chriſt a length without extent, that is to ſay, a length without length, ſince all its length is under one point that hath no length.

6. They ſay that Chriſt's body is in this place, but not locally, as if a man ſhould ſay, it is white, but not whitely. They ſay that the body of the Lord is preſent, but not corporally, but rather ſpiritually. But for a body to be ſpiritually preſent, is a thing no leſs abſurd, than for a ſpirit to be corporally preſent.

7. They will have Chriſt's body in the Sacrament to be long and large, and yet to hold no ſpace. How is that poſſible, ſince that length and breadth are Spaces.

8. They ſay that Chriſt's body in the Sacrament is preſent not circumſcriptively, that is to ſay, not bounded or encloſed of any place. Yet what they deny of the whole, they confeſs it of every ſeveral part of the body. For they cannot deny but that in the Lord's body the brains are incloſed, and circumſcribed within the ſcull, and that his heart is encloſed and limited within the *pericardium*, and the lungs within the breaſt or cheſt, ſince they ſay that it is a true human body.

9. They ſay that the conſecrated hoſt is Chriſt, and that the Prieſt breaks the Hoſt, and yet breaks not Chriſt. They ſay that Chriſt's blood is ſhed in the Maſs, and yet budges not, and comes not of the veins. But all effuſion is a motion: how then can Chriſt's blood be ſhed without motion?

10. They ſay that the Prieſt drinketh Chriſt's body and ſoul under the ſpecies of the wine. By that means they make Chriſt's body liquid. For although they ſay that the Prieſt drinks the Lord's body under the *ſpecies* of the wine: yet under theſe *ſpecies* it doth not loſe its ſolidity.

11. They

11. They ſay that Chriſt did eat himſelf and ſwallowed up his own body: Whence it followeth that he had at the ſame time his mouth in his head, and his head in his mouth, and that the whole was incloſed in one part, whereas parts are comprized in the whole. A man ſhould be eſteemed mad that would ſay that the ſcabbard is within the blade of the ſword, and the purſe within a crown. And all this without being able to tell us what benefit came to us, that Chriſt ſhould have eaten himſelf. The abſurdity redoubles in that, That Chriſt eating, was infirm and paſſible, ſpeaking, and moving, and ſitting: But Chriſt that was eaten by Chriſt, was impaſſible and without infirmity, neither ſpeaking, nor moving, ſitting, lying nor ſtanding. By this means Chriſt paſſible hath devoured the impaſſible: And Chriſt did eat himſelf, not ſuch as he was, but ſuch as he was not.

12. It is true that things contradictory may agree in one and the ſame ſubject in ſeveral times, or in ſeveral parts, or in ſeveral reſpects, that is to ſay, in comparing this thing with ſeveral things ‡. For example a man may be young and old at ſeveral times: be white in one part of his body, and black in the other. He may be tall and little, poor and rich in ſeveral reſpects, that is to ſay, in comparing him with ſeveral perſons. He may be tall in compariſon of a dwarf, little in compariſon of a Giant, rich in compariſon of a beggar, and poor in compariſon of a *Seneca*, or *Lucullus*. But here they attribute unto Chriſt contradictory things at one and the ſame time, not in ſeveral parts, and without comparing him with any other but himſelf. They will have him at one and the ſame time to have been the *contained* and the *continent*, ſpeaking and moving in the Euchariſt, and neither ſpeaking nor moving in the mouths of the Apoſ-

‡ Ariſt. l. 1. Elenchorum c. 5. whereas we ſay, eodem reſpectu, ſaith, πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ, ad idem: and gives for example of divers reſpects, that one and the ſame number may be the double and not the double being compared to divers numbers.

tles,

tles, having a length without length, an extent without a ſpace.

13. They ſay that as God may do that one and the ſame body be whole and entire in ſeveral remote places, and ſo be far and ſeparated from himſelf, that is to ſay that he be one, and not be one: So likewiſe God can make that two bodies hold but one place, by penetration of dimenſions, as they prattle in their Schools: That is to ſay, that God can make that a veſſel that holds a pint, without making it bigger or larger, may contain two pints, yea three, yea ten, yea a thouſand, yea, a million, and ſo *ad infinitum*: So that this pint ſhall contain the whole Sea, without being made bigger, and without the water of the Sea being any whit diminiſhed. Yea by this doctrine the whole world without diminiſhing of its bigneſs, may be encloſed in one grain of wheat.

14. Philoſphy by a thouſand reaſons proveth that it is impoſſible that there be any *Vacuum* in the world, and our Adverſaries teach it ſo in their Schools, and with good reaſon. By *Vacuum* is underſtood a ſpace of place which is not filled with any ſubſtance: a place that is full of nothing. Yet notwithſtanding, the *Roman* Church, by Tranſubſtantiation puts a *Vacuum* in the conſecrated cup. They ſay that this chalice is full, but they cannot tell with what body it is filled up. It is not full of wine: For they hold it is no more wine. It is not full of the body of Chriſt: for they hold that Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt filleth no place. As for the accidents they are not a body. So no bodily ſubſtance ſhall be found that filleth the chalice.

15. It is not to be imagined but that when Chriſt did break the bread to his Diſciples, ſome crums thereof fell upon the table: and ſome reſidue of that ſacred bread was left behind. Now according to the Church of *Rome*'s doctrine, in every one of theſe pieces of bread, Chriſt's body was whole and entire. Whereupon we aſk if when Chriſt (after he was riſen from the table) ſweated drops of blood, that body of the Lord

Lord which was under theſe crums, ſweated alſo drops of blood? *Item*, if when Chriſt was put under the Croſs, that body which was under theſe crums, or under the reſidues of that ſacred bread was likewiſe crucified under the ſpecies of the bread? For if it was not crucified under theſe ſpecies of the bread, behold there was two Chriſts, the one crucified, the other not crucified. Or if under thoſe ſpecies Chriſt's body was crucified, they muſt alſo put under the ſame ſpecies the Croſs, and the Soldiers that crucified him. For to be crucified without a croſs is a thing inconceivable and a plain contradiction.

16. This body alſo which was under the reſidue of the conſecrated bread, muſt of neceſſity either be living or dead when the Lord's body was in the Sepulcher: If living, behold there was two bodies of Chriſt at one and the ſame time, whereof the one was dead, the other living. Or if that body which was in theſe crums, ſuffered death under thoſe ſpecies, there was a body of Chriſt which ſuffered death without being put to the croſs, and without the Soldiers touched it.

17. That if whilſt the body of the Lord was dead, any of his Diſciples had celebrated the Euchariſt, if he had offered a living body, it would not have been the ſame body that was in the Sepulcher. Or if by pronouncing the words of conſecration he had turned the bread into a dead body, he had not offered a Sacrifice: For a dead body is not an acceptable Sacrifice. Theſe difficulties would deſerve well to conſult the Papal Oracle: or ſome deciſion of the *Sorbon*.

18. From the ſame Doctrine followeth, that when in the Proceſſion of *Corpus Chriſti* day two conſecrated hoſts meet one another and paſs by one another, Chriſt encounters himſelf, and goes to meet with himſelf. And it is to be preſumed that theſe *Hoſts* know one another, and make one to another a mutual ſalutation, and that if one ſhould come to fall, the other that is not fallen, would look upon that which is fallen, with great compaſſion.

19. This is one of the beſt of all, and wherein the Romiſh Doctors entangle themſelves moſt and trouble their

their brains exceedingly. A time was that they disputed in the Church of *Rome* whether it be in God's power to make that one body be circumscriptively in two or in many several places. As for example, whether God can make that *Philip* be at *Paris* and at *Rome* at one and the same time, contained and limited by two several remote places. But now they hold with a general consent that it is possible. Among those that have written in these our times, I know none but *Vasquez* that is of another opinion. This thing admitted to be so, it will follow that if *Philip* be at *Rome* in the water, and in the fire at *Paris*, he shall be both wet and burned at once. If one of his arms be cut off at *Paris*, he shall have but one arm at *Paris*, but at *Rome* he shall have two. If he be killed at *Paris*, he shall be dead at *Paris*, and living at *Rome*: and perhaps coming from *Rome* to *Paris*, he shall find himself to be dead, not knowing of it before, and shall assist at his own funeral. Perhaps that *Philip* of *Paris* will come to *Rome* to see himself, and being arrived there, shall not find himself there because he absented himself from *Rome*. That if both of them set forth on the way for to meet one another, one and the same man shall go to meet himself. And having met with himself, how shall their noses jumble themselves into one? How shall a man turn his back to himself? That if *Philip* doth feast at *Paris* and fast at *Rome*, one and the self same man shall be both full and empty, fat and lean at the same time. That if *Philip* meet with himself upon the way, and that *Philip* embrace *Philip*, it is evident they shall be two. For every conjunction is at least between two divers things.

20. That if the body of one and the same man may be in a thousand several places at one and the same time, it may be also in a hundred thousand places; and if in a hundred thousand, so likewise in a million, and so still in augmenting: so that at last one man's body shall be able to fill up the whole world. Indeed, the plurality of places and the *Ubiquity* comes all to one. The difference between the Church of *Rome* and those that

that put Chriſt's body every where, is only in this: the one ſay this body is every where, and the other ſay it may be every where. Truly the *Roman* Church hath no reaſon to contend with the *Ubiquitaries* about a thing which ſhe believes to be poſſible.

21. The point in Mathematicks is no quantity, and hath no magnitude, and is indiviſible: To put therefore one and the ſame point in two divers remote places, is to divide the point and to ſeparate it from itſelf. That is the thing our Adverſaries do, putting one body in two ſeveral places. For example, if *Philip* may be at *Paris* and at *Rome* at one and the ſame time, the point that is in the midſt of the apple of his eye, is the ſame point as well at *Rome* as at *Paris*, and yet it is far from itſelf, and ſeparated and divided from itſelf.

22. And ſince Angelical Spirits are but in one only place definitively, thoſe that put the Lord's body in ſeveral places at once, make it more ſpiritual than the very Spirits themſelves, and divide it from itſelf.

23. There is impiety mingled with that. For after the prieſt hath eaten the hoſt, they hold that Chriſt's body is in the prieſt's ſtomach until the ſpecies by digeſtion be deſtroyed. After then that thoſe ſpecies be deſtroyed, the Lord's body is no more there, and yet is not gone out of it: (for theſe Doctors ſay it cannot move itſelf locally.) Whereupon it muſt follow of neceſſity that this body of Chriſt which was in the Prieſt's ſtomach, is turned into nothing. And our adverſaries cannot tell us whither he is gone, nor what is become of him.

CHAP. XIX. *Of accidents without a ſubject: places of Fathers.*

THE accidents without a ſubject which they put in the conſecrated hoſt, are another ſwarm of ridiculous abſurdities and mere contradictions. For what

what is there more incompatible than this, * to wit, that *Accidentia non accidunt*, as if one ſaid, *Albentia non albent*, that the ſpeakers ſpeak not: and to forge qualities which qualify nothing: colour and nothing coloured, a length and nothing long, a roundneſs and nothing round: As if one ſhould forge a ſight without an eye, a ſickneſs without a ſick body, a halting without a leg, an eclipſe of the moon without a moon. So they put in the hoſt a taſte of bread, a colour of bread, a roundneſs of bread without bread. And as Pope *Innocent* the third ſaith in his 4 book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, chap. 11. † *There is here colour and ſavour, quantity and quality, though there be here nothing ſavoury, nothing coloured, nothing that hath quantity or quality.* In ſum God hath ſo created ſubſtances, and accidents, that as a created ſubſtance cannot be without accidents, ſo accidents cannot be without a ſubſtance: Theſe things be ſo relative one to another, as to ſeparate them, is as if one ſhould put a Father without a Son, or a Son without a Father.

This error caſts our adverſaries headlong into many others. For if the hoſt become dirty, being fallen into the mire, lo there are accidents that carry a ſubſtance: and whereas the ſubſtance is the ſubject of accidents, here on the contrary, accidents are the ſubject of the ſubſtance.

None can deny but that Ice is a ſubſtance: when then the conſecrated cup freezeth, they will have the accidents alone to be frozen, and ſo the accidents are become a ſubſtance by a new kind of Tranſubſtantiation, no leſs prodigious than the firſt, and which nevertheleſs availeth nothing to our ſalvation. Unleſs they will have Chriſt's body to be frozen.

---

* Ariſt. l. 6. Metaph. cap. 1. Loquens de accidentibus.

Οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὅτι κατ' αὐτὸ πιφυκὸς, ὅτι χωρίζεσθαι πιφυκὸς τῆς οὐσίας.

† Eſt enim hic color & ſapor, cum nihil alterutro ſit coloratum, aut ſapidum, quantum aut quale.

That

That if the hosts grow mouldy, behold there are lines, a whiteneſs, a length, a roundneſs, mouldy. If one warm the conſecrated cup ſo that it ſmoak, behold accidents which produce a ſubſtance. If (as * *Thomas* and † *Suarez* acknowlege) worms breed in the conſecrated hoſt, we muſt ſay that accidents have engendred a ſubſtance, and that Soul-leſs accidents have produced an animated Subſtance: and all that without being able to tell what profit the faithful reap thereby.

The hiſtories written by our adverſaries teſtify, that Pope ‡ *Victorinus*, the 3d, was impoyſoned in the chalice of the maſs. And that *Henry* the 7 Emperor was ſerved juſt ſo in taking the hoſt. § *Matthew Paris*, in the year 1154. relates the like of *Henry* Archbiſhop of *York*. Then it was ſaid with horror, *God is impoyſoned.* It is likely that for to avoid this inconvenience, they make the eſſay to the Pope, and taſte it before him at the maſs, as they do at his ordinary meals. That if the accidents only are impoyſoned, beſides the abſurdity of impoyſoning a length, breadth, and colour, where there is nothing long, nothing broad, nor nothing coloured, this ignominy is done to Chriſt Jeſus, that by his preſence he could not remove away the poyſon: and that his body ſerved as a vehicle to the poyſon, and that being given for the ſalvation of the ſoul, it ſerveth to bring death and deſtruction to the body.

The Fathers impugn this error plainly and expreſly. ‖ *Gregory* of *Nyſſe*, in his work of ſix days. *The*

---

* Thom. 3 part. q. 77. art. 3. Senſu deprehenditur hoſtias conſecratas putrefieri & corrumpi. Et. art 5. Ex ſpeciebus ſacramentalib. generantur vermes, ſi corrodantur. † Suarez in 3 Thomæ diſput. 57. ſ. 3. conſtat ex hoſtiis conſecratis vermes generari. ‡ Platina in Victore 3. & Clement. 5. Naucler Gener. 4. Aventinus lib. 7. pag. 598. Stella, Faſciculus temporum. § Henricus Archiepiſc. Eboracenſis, cum divine celebraret myſteria, hauſto in ipſo calice, ut aiunt, veneno obiit. ‖ Nyſſ. exam. mero. pag. 13.

Τὸ σχῆμα ἄν ἀνευσώματος.

figure

figure is not without body. * St. *Auſtin* in his 57th Epiſtle to *Dardanus, Take away the bodies from the qualities of bodies, they ſhall be no more, and therefore it is neceſſary they be not.* And a little after, *If the Maſs of the body be wholly taken away, its qualities ſhall be no more.* The ſame in his 2 book of *Soliloquies:* ‡ *Who can yield to that thou haſt demanded of me, that that which is in the ſubject, may remain after the ſubject is aboliſhed?*

Briefly, in all the Fathers you ſhall not find one that ſaith that in the Euchariſt the accidents remain without a Subject. That if they had believed it, doubtleſs when they ſaid that an accident is never without a ſubject, they would have brought this exception taken from the Sacrament.

Moreover St. *Auſtin* in his 3 book of the Trinity, Chap. 10. ſaith openly that in the Euchariſt there is no miracle wrought. *The bread* (ſaith he) *made for this uſe, is eaten when the Sacrament is received: But becauſe theſe things are known unto men, by reaſon they are made by men,* † *they may well be honoured as religious; but cannot be admired as miraculous.* In the 3 Tome of this good Doctor there are 3 books *of the marvelous things of the Scriptures,* wherein he ſpeaks nothing of Tranſubſtantiation, nor of the Euchariſt.

And thoſe that talk here of miracles, underſtand not what a miracle is. A miracle is a ſenſible and a viſible effect of the power of God, againſt or above the courſe of nature, to the end he may make his vertue known unto men. But in the maſs there is nothing ſeen of miraculous. None can boaſt without lying, that ever he ſaw the Tranſubſtantiation made. We do not deny but God may do all theſe things, if he

---

* Tolle ipſa corpora qualitatibus corporum, non erit ubi ſint: ideo neceſſe eſt ut non ſint. Et paulo poſt. Si moles ipſa corporis penitus auferatur, qualitates ejus non erit ubi ſint.

‡ Illud vero quod interrogaſti quis conceſſerit, ut quod in ſubjecto eſt maneat ipſo intereunte ſubjecto?

† Hæc honorem habere poſſunt ut religioſa, ſtuporem autem habere ut mira non poſſunt.

would.

would. But we ſay it is impoſſible that he would have ſuch things to come to paſs. For he will be no lyar, nor will contradict himſelf, nor tie and ſubmit his omnipotency to mens imagination, who employ it in ridiculous things, and forging of Chimera's and caſtles in the air.

CHAP. XX. *Anſwers to ſome examples brought out of the Scriptures by our adverſaries for to prove that the body of Chriſt hath been ſometimes in two ſeverſal places.*

TO cloak this abuſe, they ſay that as God hath made that ſometimes two bodies have filled and occupied but one place, ſo he can make that one and the ſame body be in ſeveral places at once; and thereupon they alledge for example that Chriſt entered in at the doors ſhut, *John* 20. 19. and conſequently did penetrate the wood of the doors. But they falſify the Scripture. St. *John* ſaith not that Chriſt entered in at the doors ſhut, but that he entered in when *the doors were ſhut*. * It may be that he went in by ſome other place than by the door. It may be that the wood of the door, or the ſtones of the wall yielded unto him, the creature yielding and obeying the creator, as † *Hierom* ſaith, *God went in at the door ſhut, the creature having yielded to the Creator*. By ſaying that he entered in at the door ſhut, he meant the door yielded to him, or that he opened it at his coming in. So if I ſay, a muddy brook runs through clear water, I mean it marred it as it went through. But the beſt is always to ſtick cloſe to the holy Scriptures.

Again, they alledge to the ſame purpoſe, that Chriſt's body coming out of the ſepulcher, paſſed through the ſtone that ſtopped the mouth of the Sepulcher, with-

---

* θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων.

† Hieron. ad Pammach. adv. Joh. Ieroſol. Deum tranſire per clauſam portam, & creaturam cadere creatori.

out

out taking away or removing the ſtone. *Matth.* 28. 2. But this place is likewiſe alledged falſly: For St. *Matthew* in the very ſame place ſaith the clean contrary. *There was* (ſaith he) *a great Earthquake: For the Angel of the Lord deſcended from heaven, and came, and* * *rolled back the ſtone from the door of the Sepulcher.* And *Mark*, Chap. 16. 4. ſaith the ſame. ‖ *Leo* the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, in his 95 Epiſtle to *Leo Auguſtus*, acknowledges it, ſaying, that *in the third day the fleſh of the Lord aroſe again, the ſtone of the monument being rolled back.*

In vain do they alledge that Chriſt walked upon the waters. For what is that to prove that his body may be in ſeveral places at one and the ſame time? He that walked upon the waters, is not for that far from himſelf. If Chriſt by his divine power hath made the waters firm under his feet, or ſuſtained his body that it might not ſink, he hath not for that placed his body in ſeveral places, nor changed the nature of his body. If I keep up and uphold with my hand a ſtone above the water, that changes not the nature of the ſtone, and doth not take from it its weight and heavineſs.

For to prove that the body of the Lord hath been ſometimes in two ſeveral places at once, they alledge the 23 Chapter of the Acts, verſe 11. where it is ſaid, § *That the night following, the Lord ſtood by Paul*; from whence they do infer that Chriſt's body being in heaven, ſtood nevertheleſs by St. *Paul* on earth. In ſpeaking thus, they preſuppoſe without proof that the Lord of whom is ſpoken in this place, is Chriſt only, and not God ſimply without diſtinction of perſons. Yea even in reſtraining this word, LORD, to Chriſt's perſon, there is nothing in that place that obliges us to underſtand this of the body of Chriſt, rather than of his divine nature and vertue. Might not

---

* ἐπικύλισε τὸν λίθον.

‖ Thom. 1. Concil Edition. Colonan 1567. pag. 814. Revoluto monumenti lapide, tertio die caro reſurrexit.

§ ἐπιφὰς.

the ſon of God ſpake and make himſelf ſenſible to St. *Paul* by his divine vertue, without a local and bodily approach? The *Greek* word ἐπιστὰς, whereof St. *Luke* makes uſe, ſignifieth not only to ſtand by one, but alſo to come upon him unlook'd for, to relieve and ſuccour him, and make him feel his favour, as may be ſeen *Acts* 12. 7. *Luke* 2. 9. * *Acts* 23. 27. In all theſe places the *Greek* word ſignifieth to come upon unlooked for. Now the *Roman* Church doth not believe that Chriſt comes unto the Sacrament, but believes that he is made in it.

CHAP. XXI. *Of the dignity of Prieſts. And that our Adverſaries deboſe and vilify the utility and efficacy of Maſſes, and make them unprofitable for the remiſſion of ſins. And of the traffick of Maſſes.*

THE Doctors of the *Roman* Church do ſpeak of the Euchariſt as of the higheſt myſtery of Chriſtian Religion, and extol with ſuch big terms the power of Prieſts in making Chriſt with a few words, that they call them Gods and Creators of their Creator, having a power above the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, and above all the Angels, who cannot make Chriſt, becauſe he is made already. So ſaith *Gabriel Biel* in his 4th leſſon upon the Canon of the Maſs. † *The Angels, Citizens of Heaven, dare not aſpire to the authority of Prieſthood.* And a little after: ‡ *Paſſing by the bands of Angels, let us come to the Queen of Heaven and Lady of the World. The ſame, though in plenitude of grace ſhe goes beyond all the creatures, yet ſhe yields to the Hierarchs of the Church,* (he calls the Prieſts ſo) *in the execution*

---

* Act. 12. 7. & Luc. 2. 9 ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη. Act. 23. 27. ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι.

† Ad Sacerdotii authoritatem Angeli cœlorum cives non audent aſpirare.

‡ Tranſgrediendo perinde agmina Angelorum, ad ipſam cœli Reginam, & mundi Dominam veniamus. Hæc etſi in gratiæ plenitudine creaturas ſupergrediatur univerſas, Hierarchis tamen cedit in commiſſi myſterii executione.

of

of the Myſtery committed unto them. And it is in the ſame leſſon where he ſaith, that *Chriſt is incarnate and made fleſh in the hands of Prieſts, as in the Virgin's womb, and that Prieſts do create their Creator, and have power over the body of Chriſt.*

Peter de Beſſe in his book of the *Royal Prieſthood*, chapter 2. ſpeaks thus, Saint *Peter addeth that all Prieſts are Kings, in token whereof they wear the crown.* And in the 3 chapter: *The Prieſthood and the Godhead are in ſome things to be parallelled, and are almoſt of equal greatneſs, ſince they have equal power, Matth.* 16. & 18. Again, *ſeeing that the Prieſthood walked hand in hand with the Godhead, and that Prieſts are Gods: It goes far beyond the kingly authority, and Prieſts are far above Kings.* And in the ſame place he calls them *Maſters of Kings, ſurpaſſing as much in dignity the royal office, as the ſoul ſurpaſſes the body.* Which he hath taken out of § *Baronius.* He adds: *Incredible things* (ſaith he) *but yet true, that the power of Prieſts is ſo great, and their excellency ſo noble, that Heaven depends on them. Item,* In the ſame place comparing the Prieſts with *Joſhua*, at whoſe Prayer the Sun ſtood ſtill, he ſaith: *Joſhua ſtopped but the Sun, but theſe* (to wit the Prieſts) *ſtay Chriſt being in Heaven, in the midſt of an Altar. The creature obeyed to the firſt, but the Creator obeys to theſe laſt: The Sun to the one, and God to the other, as often as they pronounce the ſacred words.* To be ſhort, he concludes that *whatſoever God is in Heaven, the Prieſt is the ſame on earth.* And all that with the approbation of the faculty of divinity at *Paris*, prefixed in the front of the book.

It is good to know that England having been a long time without a Biſhop ſubject to the Pope, the Engliſh Papiſts complained lately they had no body to confer

§ Baron. annal. An. 57. §. 31. At verò longe præſtare ſacerdotes regibus argumento quo utitur plane ſignificat. Et paulo poſt, Regem ſacris miniſtris minorem gerere ordinem certum eſt. And ſhews it by the example of St. Martin, who made a Prieſt drink before the Emperor, at the Emperor's own table.

them the orders, and to miniſter unto them the confirmation, without which the Canons ſay that a man cannot be wholly a Chriſtian. Unto whoſe deſire *Urban* now reigning being willing to ſatisfy, ſent them a titular Biſhop which he hath called *Biſhop* of *Calcedon.* But the Jeſuits, that are in poſſeſſion of ruling and governing among the Engliſh Papiſts, would not receive that Biſhop, ſaying that confirmation is not neceſſary, and that the Baptiſmal unction may ſupply the want of Epiſcopal Criſone, and that a Church may be without a Biſhop. Againſt whom the *Sorbonne* of *Paris* did caſt ſome cenſures, calling their doctrine heretical and ſcandalous. Of which cenſures theſe Jeſuits made a laughing ſtock, in a book full of bitterneſs, which they have titled *Spongia.* For to refute this *Spongia,* the *Sorbonne* made uſe of the pen of a Sorboniſt called *Petrus Aurelius.* In whoſe book § printed at *Paris* by *Charles Morell,* I find theſe words in the page 175. *The Biſhops have the power to produce Chriſt, that is to ſay, God himſelf, &c. Which vertue is in a manner infinite, and equivalent not only to the fecundity of the Virgin Mother of God, inaſmuch as the Virgin prieſts procreate upon the altar the ſame God whom the Virgin procreated firſt in her moſt holy womb: But alſo hath ſome emulation with the eternal operations by which the divine perſons are produced, and with the eternal generation, by which the Father produceth with his divine mouth the ſame* Word *which the Prieſts produce with their ſacred mouths.* And gathers from thence, that the power of Prieſts ſurpaſſes very far all the Angelical power. And in the page 177, he ſaith that *Prieſts do perfect and accompliſh the redemption of mankind.* And in the page 187. he ſaith that *the power of Prieſts is moſt like unto the Divine power, and that they have power over the real body of Chriſt, and over his myſtical body,* which is the Church: And that with the Approbation of the *Sorbon* ſet in the front of the book.

§ Anno. 1634.

Long

Long before, Pope *Urban* the ſecond, * in the year 1097, called a council at *Rome* againſt the Emperor *Henry* the fourth, in which he did thunder againſt earthly princes who challenged to themſelves the inveſtiture of benefices, alledging *it as a thing abominable that the hands of thoſe which create God their Creator by their Character, ſhould be bound to this ignominy, to be as drudges or ſervants to the hands that are night and day polluted with filthy and diſhoneſt attractations.* If theſe things be true, reaſon requires that ſo great a power hath not been given unto prieſts without great neceſſity, and without ſome great profit ſhould come thereby unto the Chriſtian Church, and that ſo many wonders as our adverſaries pile up in the Euchariſt be greatly uſeful and profitable to the faithful. Yet when we come to examine what the fruit is that comes from Tranſubſtantiation and from the Sacrifice of the Maſs, we find they reduce it almoſt to nothing, and make the maſs almoſt needleſs and unprofitable.

That appears as clear as the day, by comparing it with Baptiſm. For in Baptiſm there is no Tranſubſtantiation made. After theſe words *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, &c.* the water remains in its own nature, and is not turned into blood. Yet notwithſtanding, according to the doctrine of the *Roman* Church, Baptiſm is a thouſand times more profitable and beneficial, and of a more excellent nature. For in the *Roman* Church they hold Baptiſm with water abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. But as for the Euchariſt, our Adverſaries hold that many are ſaved without being partakers thereof: as appeareth by the example of *John the Baptiſt*, and of the *Thief* crucified with Chriſt our Lord, and of many faithful people that dye without having partaked thereof, ſpecially of thoſe which the antient Church did call Catechumens.

---

* Simeon Dunelmenſis. lib. 2. Chron. Vignier in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory pag. 310.

Secondly our adverſaries ſay, that by Baptiſm not only original ſin is pardoned, but even wholly taken away, ſo that thoſe which are baptiſed, have no more original ſin, nor nothing (to ſpeak properly) that may be called ſin. But concerning the Euchariſt, the *Roman* Church doth not believe that it wipes away the vices, nor vicious cuſtoms in ſuch ſort as it may be ſaid that all thoſe which are made partakers of the Euchariſt, be without pride, or without covetouſneſs, or without laſcivious luſts.

The principal is, that our adverſaries teach that by Baptiſm is remitted and aboliſhed all the guilt and puniſhment, both eternal and temporal, of all the ſins as well venial as mortal, committed before Baptiſm. But as for the Euchariſt, they ſay it availeth but againſt venial ſins, which they make to be ſo light, that a man needs not ſo much as to have any contrition or repentance for them. *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit: * *The rude and vulgar ſort ought not to know the particular vertue of this Sacrament in remitting venial ſins, for that remiſſion is not neceſſary unto ſalvation.* And the Catechiſm of the council of *Trent*, in the chapter of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt: † *It muſt not be doubted but by the Euchariſt, light ſins, which are called venial, are remitted and forgiven,* which remiſſion *Vaſquez* told us juſt now not to be neceſſary. *Bellarmin* in the ſeventeenth Chapter of his fourth book of the Euchariſt, putteth this among *Luther*'s errors, to have ſaid that *the firſt effect of this Sacrament is the remiſſion of mortal ſins.* And about the end of the ſame Chapter: *The whole queſtion is reduced to this article, Whether the Sacrament of the Euchariſt do confer the forgiveneſs of mortal ſins wherewith a man's conſcience is charged, or elſe (for it comes all to one) if for to re-*

---

* Vaſquez Tomo III. in 3 partem Thomæ Diſp. 179. cap. 3. num. 26. Rudes non debent hunc articulum ſcire, neque virtutem hujus Sacramenti, peculiarem ad remittendum venialia, quia hæc remiſſio non eſt ad ſalutem neceſſaria. † Catechiſ. Trident. Remiti Euchariſtiâ & condonari leviora peccata quæ venalia dici ſolent, non eſt quod dubitari debeat.

ceive

ceive the Communion worthily, it be required that a man's conſcience be not charged with any mortal ſin: For all Catholicks teach that the Euchariſt remits not ſuch ſins wherewith a man's conſcience is loaden, and therefore it is requiſite they ſhould be purged before. And in the beginning of the eighteenth Chapter: *In this chapter it is not taught that the Euchariſt be inſtituted for the remiſſion of ſins, but only for to preſerve ſpiritual life.*

And though even theſe Doctors were not ſo expreſs upon this ſubject, yet the practice of the *Roman* Church ſhews evidently that the Euchariſt and the Maſs avail nothing for the remiſſion of ſins. For he that will receive the communion, muſt be confeſſed before, and after confeſſion he receives of the prieſt the abſolution and forgiveneſs of all his ſins. Whereupon it followeth, that when a little after he receives the hoſt, there is nothing at all to be pardoned: and that the Euchariſt is a plaiſter for a healed wound, and a remedy for a diſeaſe which is not.

Of how ſmall efficacy likewiſe the Sacrifice of the Maſs is in the *Roman* Church, appears in that they ſing or ſay ten thouſand maſſes for to draw one ſoul out of Purgatory, and yet after ſo many maſſes, they doubt ſtill whether the ſoul be in Heaven, and are ſtill uncertain of its condition.

They Sacrifice in private Maſſes the body of Chriſt in a corner of a Church, for the eaſing of a ſick body, or for the curing of a horſe; but it falls out very often that both man and horſe dye, and that the prieſt hath created his Creator, and ſacrificed Chriſt for naught. Whence ariſeth a great occaſion of doubting whether Maſſes ſerve for drawing of ſouls out of Purgatory. For if Maſſes cannot obtain ſo ſmall a thing, what aſſurance have we they ſhall obtain a greater? ſeeing that no ſoul comes out of that Country for to thank thoſe who in cauſing Maſſes to be ſaid, have eaſed it with their money. For theſe private Maſſes are paid by ſuch as cauſe them to be ſaid at their intention. The Prieſt in his *Memento* names none of thoſe for whom nothing was given. Of par-

ticular Maſſes for the ſoul of a beggar, there is no ſpeech of it. Therefore *Gabriel Biel* in his 25 leſſon upon the canon of the Maſs, warns the teſtators * that bequeath any thing to the Church for the eaſing of their ſouls, to chuſe faithful executors, leſt their ſouls be fruſtrated of the ſuffrages of the Church, for lack of payment. That is to ſay, that Maſſes are not ſaid if they be not paid for before hand.

And ſeeing that our adverſaries hold with us that our Saviour Chriſt, ſitting at the right hand of God, maketh requeſt for all the faithful: It follows that he makes requeſt alſo for the ſouls that are in Purgatory. If they come out of that fire through his Interceſſion, Maſſes are unprofitable. But if they come not out; who will believe that a Maſs or a papal indulgence can do that which Chriſt's Interceſſion hath not done.

This is a maxim received among the Romiſh doctors, that a † Maſs ſaid for three or four perſons that joyn and pay for it together, is not ſo available and profitable unto them, as if every one ſhould cauſe a Maſs to be ſaid for himſelf alone. By this means the gain encreaſes three or four fold. *Emanuel Sa* the Jeſuit, in his aphoriſms, gives this rule full of great equity: § *That if a Prieſt hath received a ſum of money for to ſay a certain number of Maſſes, he may hire other Prieſts that will ſay them at a lower rate, and keep to himſelf the reſt of the money.*

And it is marvellous and ſtrange, that Prieſts, which are thought to have the power to make a God with a few words, and to carry Chriſt every day ſhut up in a

---

* Attendere debent hæc teſtatores, ut non defidibus & torpentibus aut alias minus timoratis executiones ſuarum ſtudeant committere voluntatum, ne per executionis negligentiam dum non fiunt quæ ordinarunt ſuffragiis priventur, &c. † Eman. Sa Aphoriſm. verbo Miſſæ. Si miſſa pro multis offeretur, non tantundem ſingulis prodeſſet, ac ſi pro illis ſolis offeretur. Sylveſter, Navarrus, Toletus, Suarez, Scotus. § Idem ibidem. cui datur certa pecuniæ ſumma pro Miſſis à ſe dicendis poteſt alios pro minore pretio conducere qui adjuvent, & reliquum ſibi retinere.

pix

pix or box, and in their ſtomachs, are in the mean while in ſuch contempt, and that the country prieſts are the reproach and the very dregs of the people: And that a Cardinal Deacon, who hath no power to make Chriſt, ſhould equal in magnificence the Kings of the earth, whilſt a wretched Prieſt is tipling in an Alehouſe, and of his ſinging of Maſſes makes his only living. Who when he maketh Chriſt in a private Maſs for two or three groats, may juſtly ſay with *Judas, What will you give me and I will deliver him unto you?* Men boaſt to give or deliver God unto others, and cannot give Salvation. And our adverſaries confeſs that there are ſome Prieſts damned: Whereupon it will follow, that a man which hath carried God ſo many times, is himſelf carried away by the Devil.

CHAP. XXII. *That the* Roman *Religion is a new Religion, and forged for the Pope's profit and of the Clergy.*

AFTER that our adverſaries have utterly changed and wholly disfigured the Chriſtian Religion, it becomes them very ill to accuſe us of novelty. For indeed the *Roman* Religion is a garment patched with new pieces, and a heap or pile of doctrines invented and added from age to age, beaten upon the anvil of ambition and covetouſneſs. We are ready to undergo all kinds of puniſhments, if in the five hundred years after Chriſt, (and we might deſcend lower) one man be found, that had and profeſſed a Religion coming any thing near to the *Roman* Religion as it is at this day. Can they find one Church in all the antiquity, wherein the * people was deprived of the Communion of the Cup? Hath the antient Church forbidden unto the people the reading of the holy Scriptures? Did ſhe believe the fire of Purgatory?

* Concilii Conſtan. ſeſſ. XIII. Quod in primitiva Eccleſia hujuſmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus ſub utraque ſpecie.

Was there then any ſpeech of *Roman* * Indulgences, and of the treaſure of the Church, in which the Pope gathers up the ſuperabundance of Satisfactions and penal works of Saints and Monks, and diſtributes them to others by his Indulgences? Did they make in thoſe days any images of God and of the Trinity, in ſtone or in painting? Did men worſhip the images of Saints? Was there then any penitents that whipt themſelves in publick, not only for their own ſins, but alſo to ſatisfy for the Sins of other men? Did the Biſhops of *Aſia*, *Ægypt*, *Africk*, *&c.* ſwear allegiance to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or did they take from him their Letters of Inveſture.

Was the publick Service read in an unknown tongue to the people? Did the Biſhop of *Rome* then call himſelf a God? Did he cauſe himſelf to be worſhipped? Did he give Pardons of two or three hundred thouſand years? Did he depoſe Kings, and brag of his power to give and take away their Kingdoms? Had he power to diſpenſe of Oaths and Vows? And to diſjoin Marriages lawfully contracted, under colour of Monachal profeſſion? Did they then ſpeak of Beads, Roſaries, bleſſed Grains, Agnus Dei? &c. The like I ſay of the title they give to the Virgin *Mary*, of Queen of Heaven and Lady of the world: and of the ſeveral Offices they give unto Saints, to the one the charge over ſuch a Country, to the other over ſuch a diſeaſe, to another over ſuch and ſuch a trade. As alſo the power that Prieſts take upon them to give the abſolution, and forgive ſins in the quality of Judges, is a new thing, and of the dregs of the latter ages. *Item*, Private Maſſes without Communicants and without aſſiſtants, ſaid at the Intention of thoſe that pay for them, are a thing whereof

---

* Gabriel Biel, lect. 57 in can. Miſſæ: Dicendum quod ante tempora beati Greg. modicus vel nullus fuit uſus indulgentiarum. Vid. Cajet. tract. de Indulgent. cap. 2. & Navarrum Tom. 3. Comment. de Jubil. & Indulg. ſeptimo Notabili, Art. 5 & 6.

no trace is to be found in all antiquity. As alſo the tax of the Papal Chancery, wherein the Abſolutions for * Murther, for Parricide, Inceſt, Perjury, are taxed at a certain rate of money. So many groats, or ſo many ducats for a man that hath killed his Father: ſo much for him that hath lyen with his Mother. A *Roman* Jeſuit called *Silveſter Petra Sancta* wrote lately a Book againſt me, wherein he teaches us a thing which we knew not before. He ſaith in the thirteenth chapter, that during the time of advent and Lent, the Pope permits not a man in *Rome* to paſs the whole night in a bawdy-houſe: That would be thought a violating of the holyneſs of Lent. Wherefore in thoſe days of devotion, it is only permitted to paſs the whole day and a part of the night in the Bawdy-houſe. Can ſuch Laws be found in the antient Church? Briefly, it is a very new Religion, and a heap of doctrines and Laws unheard of in all antiquity, expreſly invented for gain, and for the raiſing of the Pope's Empire, and building up that Monarchy which was not in the firſt ages of the Church: And for to keep the people in ignorance, leſt they ſhould diſcover theſe Myſteries.

For example, indulgences, private Maſſes, Maſſes and Suffrages for the dead, are very lucrative and profitable to the Pope and the Clergy. By auricular confeſſions, Prieſts know the ſecrets of families, and keep the conſciences of men in awe and ſubjection. And the abſolution of ſins is not given for nothing. The works and ſatisfactions ſupererogations of Monks, ſerve to fill up that ſpiritual treaſure of the Pope, whereof he carries the keys, diſtributing theſe ſatisfactions to the people by his indulgences ſo lucrative and profitable to the Pope and his Clergy. By Abſolutions the Prieſts make themſelves Judges of Souls, and Judges in God's cauſe. In reſerving to themſelves

---

* Cap. de abſolutionibus. Abſolutio pro eo qui interfecit patrem, matrem groſ. 7. Abſolutio pro eo qui falſificavit litteras Apoſtolicas, groſſos 15.

and

and unto Kings the communion of the Cup, they make themſelves companions unto Kings, and exalt themſelves above the people. By the ſingle life of Biſhops, and other Clergymen, the Pope keeps the Eccleſiaſtical goods from being waſted and conſumed, and from being diverted and turned to the relief and enriching of the Children. In painting God the Father dreſſed like a Pope, they plant this opinion in the mind of the people, that the Pope is like unto God, and that God makes great account of the Pope, ſince he borrows his habit. By canonizing of Saints, the Pope makes the people to worſhip his grooms, and gives the title of Saint for a recompence of ſervices. By the Sacrament of penance, the Pope and his Prieſts uſurp the power of impoſing corporal and pecuniary puniſhments, * ſo far as to cauſe Kings to be whipt. By the Service in the Latin tongue he entertains the people in ignorance, and giving them his tongue, planteth in the midſt of them a mark of his Empire. He gives them the *Roman* language for to tame and inure them to the *Roman* Religion. The Pope's power to unthrone Kings, makes him King of Kings, and exalts him on an Empire above all the Greatneſs that is in the World. Images, which are called ignorant men's books, accuſtom the people to forget, and be without the Scriptures, which in thoſe Countries, where the inquiſition reigns, is a book altogether unknown among the people. By Tranſubſtantiation, Prieſts make Chriſt, and have him in their own power. By Holydays that the Pope ordains, he rules the Civil Government, cauſing the Shops to be ſhut up, and the Seats of Juſtice and of the King's Council to ceaſe. When the Merchant's ſhop ſhutteth, the Clegymen's ſhop openeth. For then do the people go to gain pardons (as they term it) and viſit Reliques, and always the Baſon is by. By the diſtinction

* Thus cauſed he *Henry* the ſecond of *England* to be whipt by a troop of Monks. As is to be ſeen in *Matth. Paris*, and in Weſtmonaſterienſis.

of

of meats and faſting days, the Pope rules the Markets, and bellies, and Kitchens, and Kings and People's tables. And the more prohibitions there is, the oftner come they to the Pope and to the Prelates for to have diſpenſations. The Pope hath made of matrimony a Sacrament, that he might take away from the civil Magiſtrates and Judges Secular the right of judging of ſuch cauſes, for it belongs to the Church to judge of Sacraments.

By Diſpenſations in degrees of conſanguinity which in the Word of God hinders the marriage, the Pope maketh that the children of Princes (for ſuch diſpenſations are given but to Great ones) are obliged to defend the Pope's authority, if they will be held for legitimate. By Annates or firſt fruits of Benefices, and the ſale of Archiepiſcopal Cloaks, the Pope makes an incredible gain. And there is ſuch a Cloak, for which he draws above threeſcore thouſand Ducats. By the power which the Pope aſſumes to himſelf to change the Commandments of God, and to diſpenſe of Vows and Oaths made unto God, he exalts himſelf above God. For he that can free and exempt men from obeying God and being faithful to him, muſt be greater than God.

The invocation of Saints, the adoration of reliques, and the miracles which are ſaid to be wrought at thoſe reliques, ſerve to build up many Churches and Monaſteries, which are ſo many props to the papal domination. In ſum, all the ſubtilty and policy in the world hath been brought therein. Never was there any Empire built with ſo much craft and cunning. The doctrine which teacheth that Chriſt Jeſus by his death hath delivered us from the guilt and puniſhment of ſins before baptiſm: But as for the ſins committed after baptiſm, that we muſt bear the puniſhment for them, either in this life, or in purgatory; hath clipped Chriſt's benefit for to make place unto their traffick, and for to give credit to their indulgences, and maſſes for the dead. In a word, they make profit of all: Death itſelf is tributary to the *Roman* Clergy,

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII. *Anſwer to the queſtion made unto us by our Adverſaries: Where was your Religion before* Calvin.

THIS demand which every foot is made unto us by our Adverſaries, viz. *Shew us where your Religion was before Calvin*, is altogether unjuſt and deceitful. For to keep us from examining the *Roman* religion by the holy Scripture, they amuſe us with human hiſtories. For this is not a queſtion of divinity, but of hiſtory, wherein God hath not commanded us to be learned and ſkilful that we may be ſaved: But hath commanded us to be inſtructed in his word. At the day of judgment, God ſhall not aſk us whether we have believed as they did believe before *Calvin*; but St. *Paul* tells us that God ſhall judge us according to his Goſpel, and that men ſhall be judged by the law of God. *Rom.* 2. 12. & 16. That if for to be ſaved it were neceſſary to know the hiſtory of the ages before *Calvin*, mounting upwards from *Calvin* to the Apoſtles time, hardly one Chriſtian of a thouſand could be ſaved.

That if the queſtion be touching hiſtories, it is certain we muſt begin by the antienteſt, and that it belongs to our Adverſaries to ſhew where their Religion was in the time of the Apoſtles, afore they ſpeak of the time before *Calvin*. There they are at a ſtand and driven to a non-plus, and not being able to ſhew their Religion in the Apoſtles writings, they ſend us back to an unwritten word, which depends on the Pope's authority, whom they make judge in his own cauſe: And make the Church of *Rome* the ſovereign judge of her own proper duty.

The principal is, that the Chriſtian Church is ſubject to the Laws and to the practice of the Church of the Apoſtles time, and not to the example of what was done before *Calvin*. Of whom they ſpeak as of the inventor of our Religion, becauſe he exhorted us to believe the holy Scriptures. For *Calvin* gave us not any Laws. We ſpeak not of him in our Sermons, we

ground

ground not our ſelves upon his authority, we do not ſay of him what the Church of *Rome* ſaith of the Pope, to wit, that he could not err. We do not call our ſelves Calviniſts, as our Adverſaries acknowledge themſelves to be Papiſts, and make glory of that title, as * Cardinal *Baronius* doth in his Martyrology at the 16th of *October*, where he ſaith that *a man cannot be adorned with a higher degree of glory than to be called a Papiſt*. So that after his account the title of Papiſt is of as much worth as the name of a Chriſtian.

This demand is ſo much the more abſurd, as it is made unto us. For when they aſk of us where our Religion was before *Calvin*, they preſuppoſe that the Orthodox Church ought to be viſible in all ages: Which the Scripture ſaith not, but foretels us of great revolts and falſe doctors that ſhall teach men to abſtain from marriage and from meats which God hath created for to be received with thankſgiving, 1 *Timothy* 4. 3. It foretels us that all the earth raviſhed in admiration, ſhall go after the Beaſt, *Revel.* 13. 3. and that when Chriſt ſhall come, hardly ſhall he find faith on the earth, *Luke*, 18. 8. It tells us of the Son of perdition that ſhall be called God, § and ſhall do wonders; and of the great harlot cloathed with ſcarlet, who ſitteth in the City with ſeven hills, that reigneth over the Kings of the earth, which ſeduceth Kings and makes them drunk, and is made drunk with the blood of the ſaints and faithful. It tells us in the twelfth of the *Revelation* that wings are given to the Church for to fly into the Wilderneſs, and live there hidden for a time. It warns us that the broad way where the throng of People paſſeth, leadeth into perdition.

Which things afford us another conſideration. That is if a cut purſe aſketh him whom he hath robbed of his purſe; *Where is thy Purſe?* This thief added ſcof-

---

* Certe nullo ſublimiori gloriæ titulo exornare, nec certius, eos eſſe Catholicos, demonſtrare potuiſſent, quàm eos nuncupare Romanos atque Papiſtas.

§ 2. Theſ. 3. Revel. 17.

ſing

ſing and deriſion to his theft. So the Pope, who ſince ſo many ages hath perſecuted to the uttermoſt the Church of God, and endeavoured to aboliſh it, addeth to this violence this deriſion and ſcoffing, when he aſketh, *Where was your Religion at that time?* For it were rather his part to inform us where he had put her himſelf, and to what paſs he had reduced her.

In the mean while, though we are not bound to anſwer to ſuch an abſurd and unjuſt a demand, and which doth not at all concern Religion, and being propounded by men whoſe Religion is new, and that have ſwerved from the Antient Chriſtian Religion, and who even ſay that the Pope may add unto the Creed new articles of faith: Yet we ſay that it is four or five hundred years ago, ſince the Pope perſecuted with fire and ſword the faithful ones, whereof there was a great number in *France*, in the *Low countries*, *England*, *Germany*, *Bohemia*, and *Hungary*, to whom our Adverſaries gave odious nicknames, calling them *Valdenſes*, *Albigenſes*, *Sodomites*, *Picards*, &c. And fathering upon them many impious and abominable doctrines far from their belief. Of whom were Maſſacre'd in few months by one *Dominick*, author of the order of the *Jacobins*, above two hundred thouſand in *Languedoc* and *Goſconie*, in Pope *Innocent* the third's time. Of theſe faithful people, we have the confeſſion agreeable to ours, written in their own Language: A reſidue of which People remains ſtill in *Bohemia*, *Hungary*, *Moravia*, and in the Valleys of *Angrogne*, *Luzerne*, *Peruſe*, St. *Martin*, *Pragela*, *Merindoles*, and *Cabrieres*, which Churches have joined themſelves to ours, ſo ſoon as it pleaſed God to diſplay in *France* and the neighbouring countries, the banner of his goſpel. And the ſudden alteration that happened in *Luthers*'s time, ſhewed that *Europe* was full of People that knew the truth, and groaned after a Reformation, which the Pope promiſed always, but would never ſuffer it to come to execution.

And for to ſpecify ſomething touching the age immediately before *Calvin*: *Æneas Sylvius*, who in the year 1458, attained to the Popedom, was a capital enemy

nemy to the faithful (of whom in his time *Bohemia* and *Hungary*, and the neighbouring countries were full) and was a firebrand of war for to provoke the Emperors and Popes to perſecute them. Wherefore his teſtimony in this point is the more worthy of credit. This man in his 130 Epiſtle, deſcribeth his journey to *Tabor*, a City in *Bohemia*, and the Religion of the Inhabitants, and the conferences he had with them. *Their ſect* (ſaith he) *is peſtilentious and abominable, and worthy of the uttermoſt puniſhment. They will not admit the Church of* Rome *to have the Primacy, nor that the Clergy ſhould have any thing in propriety. They pull down the Images of God and of his Saints. They deny Purgatory, They hold that the Prayers of Saints which reign with Chriſt, avail nothing unto men. They obſerve no holy day but the Lord's day and Eaſter. Contemn faſting and the Canonical Prayers. They give the Euchariſt under the kinds of bread and wine, even to little Children and to mad men. When they conſecrate the Sacrament, they ſay nothing but the Lord's Prayer, and the words of Conſecration. They change no habits and take not any ornaments. Yea ſome of them are ſo mad as to hold that the very body of Chriſt is not in the Sacrament of the Altar, but that it is only the repreſentation thereof: Being wandring Sectators of* Berengarius *unconverted. Among the Sacraments of the Church they admit the Baptiſm, and the Euchariſt, and Marriage, and Orders. But as for the Sacrament of Penance, they make little account of it. But of Confirmation and extream Unction, they make no reckoning at all. They are very oppoſite to the Religion of Monks, and affirm they be diabolical inventions. They uſe meer Water in Baptiſm. They have no holy Water. They do not conſecrate their Church-yards. They bury their dead in the fields and with beaſts, as alſo they deſerve it, &c.* And he addeth that the Emperor, inſtead of deſtroying them, granted unto them ſafety and liberty. But he ſhould have added to this, that the Emperor *Sigiſmond* having by arms aſſaulted and ſcuffled with them, loſt there many Battles. For which cauſe he did let them reſt in peace. In this diſcourſe, *Æneas* hath chopt

an

and thruſt in ſome calumniations; as when he ſaith they give the Euchariſt to mad men and to Infants, and bury their dead with beaſts. Things very abſurd, and that never were. As for the reſt, all our Religion almoſt is ſeen in it.

Hungary at the ſame time was full of faithful People holding the ſame belief. They preſented to the King *Uladiſlaus*, in the year of our Lord, 1508. their confeſſion of faith, conformable to ours, defending themſelves againſt an *Auſtin* Fryer that had accuſed them to the King of many errors, namely, for that they did not obey the Pope, called not upon Saints, denied Purgatory, received the Communion in both kinds, and rejected Tranſubſtantiation. Upon which laſt point, they ſpeak thus: § *This Fryer writeth that the bread and wine in their natural ſubſtance are changed into the body and blood of Chriſt, and are changed into Chriſt God and man, ſo that nothing of the ſubſtance of the bread and wine remaineth, but that the only accidents are meerly upheld by miracle. This Confeſſion of faith hath no foundation in the Lord Chriſt Jeſus his words, who never ſpake one word of the converſion of the ſubſtance.* And a little after, *By that is manifeſted that the Primitive Church had this belief, and hath confeſſed it, and hath not erred, and did not bow at this Sacrament. For in that time they received the Sacrament fitting, and reſerved nothing of it, and carried none of it out of the houſe, &c.*

About the ſame time, in the year 1520. *Calvin* being yet very young, the faithful of *Provence* preſented to the Parliament of *Aix* their confeſſion of faith, conformable to ours. Upon the point of the Sacrament, they ſpeak thus: *We are not entangled with any errors or hereſies condemned by the Antient Church, and we hold the documents and inſtructions approved by the true faith. And as for the Sacraments particularly, we have the Sacraments in honour, and believe that they*

§ This Confeſſion is to be found in Faſciculo rerum expetendarum.

be

be teſtimonies and ſigns by which God's grace is confirmed and aſſured in our conſciences. For which cauſe we believe that Baptiſm is a ſign whereby the purgation that we obtain by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, is corroborated, in ſuch ſort that it is the true waſhing of Regeneration and Renovation. The Lord's Supper is the ſign under which the true Communion of his body and blood is given unto us. And theſe poor Churches were the remainder of the horrible Perſecutions exerciſed by the ſpace of three or four hundred years by Kings and Princes at the inſtigation of Popes. Which Churches they had defamed with horrible hereſies, accuſing them to be *Manicheans*, and enemies of Marriage; even as they accuſe us now to be enemies unto the Saints and the bleſſed Virgin, and to believe that good works are not neceſſary to ſalvation, and that we make God author of ſin.

A few years before, under the reign of good King *Lewis* the 12th, who was called the *Father of the People*, happened a memorable thing which *Carolus Molinæus* a famous Juriſconſulte reciteth in his Book of the *French Monarchy*. He ſaith that certain Cardinals and Prelates did go about to ſtir up and incite this good King to deſtroy and exterminate the Inhabitants of *Cabrieres* and *Merindoles* in *Provence*, ſaying they were Sorcerers, Inceſtuous Perſons, Hereticks, condemned already by the Apoſtolic See. But this King anſwered that he would condemn no body to death, without hearing both ſides, and be fully acquainted with the cauſe. And that for that end he ſent one *Adam Fumee*, a maſter of requeſt, and *John Parin* a Jacobin Fryer, his confeſſor, for to tranſport themſelves into the place where they lived, and be informed of their religion. Which they did and *reported to the King, that among theſe men they had found no Images, nor any trace or veſtige of any ornaments of Maſſes or Papal Ceremonies. That they had found nothing touching magical arts, whoredoms and other crimes laid upon them. The King underſtanding this, cried out with a loud voice, and ſwore that thoſe people were better Chriſtians than he and his People, and confirmed their priviledges*

priviledges and immunities. That fell out about the year 1512. *Calvin* ſcarce being born.

Pope *Julius* the ſecond, made war againſt this King: But the King defeated his army, and the Emperor's near the city of *Ravenna*: Aſſembled a Council at *Piſa* againſt the Pope: Cauſed money to be coined with this Inſcription round about. *PERDAM BABYLONIS NOMEN*, as *Thuanus* relateth in the firſt Book of his Hiſtory.

But under the reign of King *Francis* the firſt, Succeſſor unto *Lewis* the 12th. theſe poor Churches of *Provence* ſuffered hard and rude perſecutions and maſſacres. Nevertheleſs, they ſubſiſt yet at this day, and *Thuanus* in the ſixth Book of his Hiſtory, ſpeaketh of their Religion: He ſaith that theſe *Valdenſes* (for he terms them ſo) *did ſay that the Church of* Rome *had departed from the faith of Chriſt Jeſus, and was become* Babylon, *and the great Whore whereof is ſpoken in the* Revelation: *That none ought to obey the Pope nor his Prelates: That Monachal life was a ſink of the Church, and an infernal thing: That the fire of Purgatory, the Maſs, the Dedication of Churches, the Service of Saints, and Suffrages for the Dead, were inventions of Satan.* Then he addeth: *To theſe true and principal heads of their doctrine, others were falſly added, touching Marriage, the Reſurrection, the State and condition of the Dead, and touching meats.*

The ſame Author in the 27th Book ſpeaketh of the Churches of the Vallies of the *Alpes*, which he ſaith to be deſcended from the antient *Valdenſes*, which have yet at this very day a Religion altogether conformable to ours: And ſaith, that in the year 1560. they preſented their confeſſion of faith unto thoſe whom the *Duke* of *Savoy* their Lord had ſent them, by which they declared that they ſtuck faſt and adhered to the antient doctrine contained in the Old and New Teſtament, and to the Apoſtles Creed, and to the four firſt general Councils, and that for the rule of a good life they kept themſelves cloſe to the ten Commandments of the Law. That they taught to live chaſtely, ſoberly, and juſtly, and to yield obedience unto

unto Princes and Magiſtrates. That nevertheleſs they rejected the ſacrifice of the Maſs, the Sacrament of Penance, Auricular Confeſſion, human Traditions, Prayers for the Dead, but cleaved to the holy Scriptures. Which things they ſaid to have received not from *Calvin*, but from Chriſt and his Apoſtles: For the ſtrait paſſages and ſteep places of the *Alpes* had preſerved them from the perſecutions of the Pope and his Miniſters.

And at this very day alſo, the Church of *Ethiopia*, which containeth 17 great provinces, agrees with us in the fundamental points of Faith, though ſhe have ſome ſmall ſuperſtitions. For ſhe believeth not Purgatory, nor Tranſubſtantiation. She maketh no elevation nor adoration of the Hoſt. Is not ſubject to the Pope. Knows not what indulgences mean, nor private Maſſes. Celebrateth the divine ſervice in the *Æthiopian* tongue. Gives the Communion to the people under both kinds. Worſhips no Images. Hath but one table or altar in the Church. Hath Monks, but they are married, and earn their living by the work of their hands. Baptiſeth not the male Children till forty days after their birth, and the females after threeſcore days: an aſſured ſign that ſhe believes not the baptiſm of Water to be neceſſary unto Salvation. Theſe things are ſeen in the hiſtory of *Francis Alvarez*, a Portugal Monke, who lived ſix years at the court of the great *Negus* Emperor of *Ethiopia*.

The *Ethiopian* Churches are calumniouſly and falſly accuſed to be *Eutichians*. True it is they be ſubject to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* who is an *Eutichian*. But that ſubjection is not in the doctrine, but only in that the ſaid Patriarch hath the right of nomination of the *Abuna* of chief prelate of the *Ethiopians* when the See is void.

The *Greek* Church more ancient than the *Roman*, and of whom the Church of *Rome* received the Chriſtian Religion, doth not acknowledge the Pope, rejecteth his Laws, knoweth not what his indulgences are. Believeth neither the Purgatory, nor the Tranſubſtantiation. Celebrateth the divine ſervice in the *Greek* tongue.

tongue. Hath her Prieſts married. Hath no liturgies or private Maſſes, and comes a great deal nearer to our religion than to the Romiſh.

And this I ſay, not that we ground ourſelves upon any of theſe examples, or would be authoriſed thereby. For we do ground ourſelves only upon the word of God, and of his bleſſed Apoſtles, contained in the holy Scripture, unto which the Pope braggeth not to be ſubject, and doth not acknowledge it for Judge. In a word, we muſt ſtand firm upon this: To wit, that our Adverſaries muſt ſhew us where their Religion was in the time of the Apoſtles, before we do ſhew them where our Religion was before *Calvin.*

CHAP. XXIV. *That our Adverſaries reject the Fathers, and ſpeak of them with contempt.*

OUR Adverſaries being preſſed by the holy Scripture, are wont to have recourſe to the Fathers, whom nevertheleſs they receive not for Judges, and acknowledge in them a multitude of errors, and ſpeak of them with great contempt.

Denis Petau, a Jeſuit, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius* page 244, ſpeaketh thus. * *In the moſt holy Fathers, and chiefly in Chryſoſtome his Homilies, are diſperſed many things, which if thou wouldeſt accommodate to the rule of truth, ſhall be found to be void of ſenſe.*

Cardinal *Baronius* in his Annals in the year 34. §. 213. † *The Catholick Church doth not follow always the moſt holy Fathers in the interpretation of the Scripture.* ‡ *And in the* §. 185. *Hierom hath erred for lack of memory.* And in the year 31. §. 24. he checks St. *Auſtin* for not underſtanding well theſe words of

---

* Multa ſunt à ſanctiſſimis Patribus, præcipueque à Chryſoſtomo in Homiliis aſperſa, quæ ſi ad exactæ veritatis regulam accommodare volueris, boni ſenſus inania videbuntur.

† Sanctiſſimos Patres in interpretatione Scripturæ non ſemper in omnibus Catholica ſequitur Eccleſia.

‡ Conſultius dicendum putamus Hieronymum, (ſi tamen ille iſe eſt) ut humana fert infirmitas, memoriâ lapſum.

the

the Lord, *Thou art Peter, &c.* And in the year 60. §. 20. he is vexed againſt *Theodoret*, becauſe he rejected the ſervice of Angels grounded upon a place of St. *Paul, Coloſ.* 2. ‖ *By this* (ſaith he) *it may be ſeen that Theodoret (with his good leave) did not well apprehend the Apoſtles meaning.* And in the year 369. §. 24. *Hillary had alſo his defects.*

Alphonſus à Caſtro in his firſt Book of *Hereſies* Chap. 7. * *Oftentimes the opinions of the Fathers are repugnant one to the other.*

Melchior Canus in his ſeventh book of common places, Chapter 3. ‡ *Seeing there is none of the Saints, except only thoſe that have written the Canonical Books, but have ſpoken by the ſpirit of man, and ſometimes erred in that which afterwards was known to belong to the faith: It is evident that from ſuch an authority none can build a certain and aſſured faith.* And thereupon he produceth for an example, the errors of many Fathers, ſo far as to ſay that *againſt the ordinary courſe of nature they bring forth monſters.*

Sextus Senenſis in the Preface upon the fifth book of his *Bibliotheca:* † *Theſe antient Maſters of the Churches have ſometimes ſwerved from the ſcope of the truth at which they aimed.* And in the ſame place: § *In the Books of the holy Doctors, whoſe authority is read in the Church, are found ſometimes things wicked and Heretical:* And he ſpeaketh this after *Anſelme* in his Commentaries upon the ſecond to the *Corinthians.*

Maldonat the Jeſuit upon the fifth of St. *John*, checking St. *Auſtin* for not well conceiving in what

---

‖ Ex his videas haud feliciter (ejus pace dictum ſit) Theodoretum aſſecutum eſſe Pauli verborum ſenſum.

* Sanctorum Patrum ſententiæ ſæpe invicem repugnant.

‡ Num. 2. Cum Sanctorum quiſque, his duntaxat exceptis qui libros Canonicos ediderunt, humano ſpiritu locutus fuerit, & aliquando vel in eo errarit quod ad fidem pertinere poſtea demonſtratum eſt, &c

† Priſci illi Eccleſiarum Magiſtri nonnihil interdum à propoſito veritatis ſcopo aberraverunt.

§ In libris ſanctorum Doctorum quos authentica legit Eccleſia, nonnunquam inveniuntur quædam prava vel hæretica.

ſenſe

ſenſe Chriſt calleth himſelf the bread, ſaith, † *I am perſwaded that if* Auſtin *had lived in our Days, he would have been of another opinion.* And in the ſame place: *I do approve of this interpretation much more than that of* Auſtin's.

Cardinal Cajetan in the beginning of his Commentaries upon *Geneſis*: ‡‡ *Let none deteſt a new ſenſe of the Scripture, under colour it diſagreeth from the antient Doctors. For God hath not tyed the Expoſition of the Scriptures to the ſenſe or opinions of the antient Doctors.*

Andradius in his ſecond Book of the defence of the faith of *Trent*: § *I ſay nothing of Auſtin, Baſil, Athanaſius, both Cyrils, Chryſoſtome, and Epiphanius, to whoſe opinions we are not always tyed.*

Fererius the Jeſuit, in his eighth Book upon *Geneſis*, Diſp. 1. ‖‖ *I am aſhamed to tell what I muſt ſay here againſt the beſt writers, ſo much do they ſay things not only falſe, but alſo ſhameful and abſurd.* Now the Fathers whom he meaneth, are *Juſtin Martyr, Ireneus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Ambroſe, Lactantius, Euſebius, Sulpitius Severus.*

Salmeron the Jeſuit in the eighth *Prolegomene*: ‡ *Every Father expoundeth one place of the Scripture otherwiſe than the reſt, yea one and the ſame Father expounds it in ſeveral faſhions.* And in the third *Prolegomene*, page 13. He bringeth many examples of Fathers which contradict themſelves.

The ſame man in the 51 Diſput. upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, acknowledgeth that the Fathers generally

---

† §. 81. Hoc dico perſuaſum me habere D. Auguſtum, ſi noſtra fuiſſet ætate, longe aliter ſenſurum fuiſſe. Et § 71. Hanc interpretationem multo magis probo quàm illam Auguſtini.

‡‡ Nullus deteſtetur novum ſacræ Scripturæ ſenſum, ex hoc quod diſſonat à priſcis Doctoribus. Non enim alligavit Deus expoſitionem Scripturarum priſcorum Doctorum ſenſibus.

§ Ut Auguſtinum, Baſilium, &c. taceam, quorum non ſemper ſumus opinionibus addicti.

‖‖ Pudet dicere quæ de optimis ſcriptoribus hoc loco dicturus ſum, adeo ſunt non modo falſa, ſed pudenda & abſurda.

‡ Pag. 85. Quiſque Patrum diverſe ab alio unum locum exponit, immo etiam unus & idem vario modo.

are

are againſt him in the point of the conception of the Virgin *Mary*. Whereupon he ſhifts off thus; † *Againſt this multitude objected againſt us, we anſwer by the word of God*, Exodus 23. *Thou ſhalt not yield in judgment to the opinion of many, for to decline from the truth.*

Cornelius Mus Biſhop of *Bitonto*, upon the 14th Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*: ||| *I would give more credit (to confeſs it ingenuouſly) to one Pope, than to a thouſand Auſtins, a thouſand Hieroms, a thouſand Gregories.*

I ſhould never make an end if I would produce all the places wherein our Adverſaries abuſe the Fathers, and accuſe them of error, or of untruth, or of ignorance; and have reaſon in ſome things, in others not. § *Chryſoſtome* accuſeth often the Virgin *Mary* of ambition, temerity, and importunity. ‡ *Juſtin Martyr* and *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſay, that God created the Sun and the Moon, that the *Gentiles* might worſhip them, leſt they ſhould be without Religon. ‖ *Juſtin*, *Ireneus*, *Lactantius*, *Ambroſe*, *Tertullian*, and many others, were Chiliaſtes, holding a reign of Chriſt that is to endure one thouſand years in feaſtings and carnal delights. ¶ *Ambroſe* teacheth that baptiſm conferred in the name of the holy Ghoſt, without naming the Father or the Son, is good and warrantable. *Auſtin* hath condemned the children dead without baptiſm, to the eternal flames. *Cyprian* taught the Rebaptization of Hereticks, and aſſembled a Council, in which he did

† Contra hanc quam objectant multitudinem, reſpondemus ex verbo Dei, Exod 23. In judicio, plurimorum non acquieſces ſententiæ, ut devies à vero.

||| Ego (ut ingenuè fatear) plus uni ſummo Pontifici credidérim in his quæ fidei myſteria tangunt, quàm mille Auguſtinis, Hieronymis, Gregoriis.

§ Chryſ. homil. 45 in Matth. & 21 in Iohannem.

‡ Iuſtin. Dial. in Tryph. Clem. 6. Strom.

‖ See Ireneus in his 5th Book.

¶ Lib. 1. de Spiritu Sancto. c. 2.

condemn the doctrine of the *Roman* Church. †‖ *Hillary* taught that our Saviour Chriſt ſuffered no pain at his death: And that the Virgin *Mary* is to be purged by the fire of the laſt judgment. ‡ St. *Hierom* calleth Marriage an ignominy, the end whereof is death, and the perſons married, Veſſels unto diſhonour. ‖ He taught alſo that Biſhops and Prieſts are equal by divine right. Whereupon *Bellarmin* in his firſt Book *de Pontif.* Chap. 8. ſaith: *This opinion is falſe and muſt be refuted in its due place.* *Gregory* of *Nice* in the firſt Oration of the Lord's Reſurrection, teacheth that when Chriſt inſtituted the Euchariſt, his body was already dead, and that his ſoul was in hell. For which he is cenſured by the Jeſuit *Salmeron*, ſaying; § *In theſe words of Gregory there are many things which the Church doth not approve off.* *Clemens Alexandrinus* teacheth that the Pagans were ſaved by Philoſophy. *Tertullian* maketh God to be corporal. *Clement* the firſt, Biſhop of *Rome*, in a Decretal Epiſtle, will have goods and women to be common. In the ninth Tome of *Baronius* Annales, there is an Epiſtle of Pope *Gregory* the ſecond, wherein he declareth that it is not lawful to paint out God the Father: But *Baronius* ‖§ noteth in the margin, that the Church now hath ordained of it otherwiſe.

Six hundred and thirty Biſhops decreed at the Counceil of *Chalcedon*, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be equal in all things to the Biſhop of *Rome*. The *Milevitan* Council where St. *Auſtin* was preſent, and framed the Canons of it, forbiddeth upon pain of a curſe, to appeal beyond the Sea, that is to ſay to appeal out of *Africk* to *Rome*.

The ſixth Council of *Carthage* confirmeth the ſame prohibition, and writeth to *Celeſtin* Biſhop of *Rome* long Letters which are inſerted in the Council, where-

†‖ Lib. 10. de Trinitate, & in Pſal. 68, & 138. & in Pſal. 118. litera Gimel.

‡ Hier. lib. 1. & 2. in Iovinianum, & ſæpe alibi.

‖ Hier. in Epiſt. ad Titum c. 1.

§ Salm. Tomo. XI. Tract. 7. de modo reſurr. Chriſti pag. 49. Cujus in verbis continentur multa non ſatis in Eccleſia recepta.

‖§ Poſtea uſu veni[illegible] ut pingatur in Eccleſia Deus, &c.

in

in the Council warns him to take heed henceforth from receiving any appeals out of *Africk*, and not to ſend them his legates any more; nor make uſe any more of ſuppoſed canons for to advance his authority, and not to bring in worldly pride into the church. In all theſe things and in a thouſand others more, the *Roman* church condemneth the fathers, and maketh no reckoning of their authority. Whence appeareth that it is to no purpoſe that our adverſaries in certain queſtions alledge the fathers unto us, ſeeing themſelves reject them, and ſubject them to the judgment of the Pope and church of *Rome*.

CHAP. XXV. *Of the corruption and falſification of the Fathers writings: And of the difficulty to underſtand them.*

IN the allegation of fathers about our controverſy, we have this diſadvantage, that we have them but by the hands of our own adverſaries. For all the impreſſions that have been made of them, were made upon the manuſcripts found in monaſteries, written by Monks, who had fair opportunities to clip and alter them at their pleaſure, and ſet old titles upon new books made and compoſed by themſelves. It is a hard caſe to one of the parties that go to law, when he can make uſe of no other writings but of ſuch as his own adverſe party furniſheth him with, who hath truſted in ſuch clauſes as ſeemed good unto him. But it is come to paſs through the providence of God, that the moſt part of theſe falſifications are ſo groſs and ſo palpable, that we have not had much pains to diſcover the falſity of many places and falſe works which are in ſo great number, that if they were taken away, the fathers works would be found diminiſhed of a third part. Thoſe among our adverſaries that are well read in the fathers, acknowledge the ſame with us, and paſs condemnation in this point. Read *Sixtus Senenſis* about the end of his fourth book, and the book of Cardinal *Bellarmin of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, where he hath put the catalogue of the fathers works. There ſhall ye wonder to ſee the multitude of books,

which he ſaith to be doubtful or manifeſtly counterfeit. Which cauſes men to doubt of the other works, whoſe falſity is not eaſily found out.

For the diſcovering of theſe falſities, we have been helped by the catalogue of the works of the antient writers, which *Photius*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who wrote about the year of our Lord 878, hath put into his library. And by *Gennadius*, a prieſt of *Marſeilles*, that wrote a book of the *Illuſtrious men*, about the year of our Lord 492. *Item*, by the diverſity of ſtile. *Item*, by certain places of the fathers, which are alledged by *Ivo*, *Gratian*, *Burchardus*, *Lombard*, *Thomas* and others, quite otherwiſe than they be found in the editions printed in this laſt age. *Item*, by other places of the ſame fathers which ſay the contrary: So that one and the ſame father is oftentimes found to contradict himſelf.

Even as the ninth age, was the age wherein the decretals of the antient biſhops of *Rome* were forged, under the name of one *Iſidorus Mercator*, which was falſely framed for the grounding of the Papal Monarchy, which with might and main was a building in that age: So the eleventh age, in which *Berengarius*, archdeacon of *Angiers* withſtood and impugned ſtoutly and vigorouſly the opinion of the real preſence and Tranſubſtantiation, was the age wherein were forged ſundry works in the behalf of that error, and divers clauſes were chopt into the books of the antient fathers. Of this falſe coin is the book attributed to ‡ *Cyprian, of the Lord's Supper*, which all the learned of the *Roman* church acknowledge not to be of his making, and the *Cathecheſes Myſtagogical* of *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*. The *Catecheſes* of *Gregory* of *Nyſſe* are indeed his, but horribly corrupted and full of errors, which the *Roman* church approves not. There is mention made there of one *Severus* an Heretic, who is poſterior to this *Gregory* above 150 years.

---

‡ Bellar. lib. de Script. Eccleſ. Sixtus Senenſis ſub finem libri quart.

Of

Of theſe falſifications and divers others, we have entreated more at large in the book againſt Cardinal du *Perron*. He that ſhould take away from the works of *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, *Hierome*, *Auſtin* and *Athanaſius*, the counterfeit books, ſhould diminiſh the writings of theſe fathers more than of a third part.

Wherefore after ſo many falſities diſcovered, when our adverſaries to object us ſome place of a Father, we might very juſtly deſire them to prove unto us that that place was not added or depraved by ſome falſifier as well as ſo many others. By all manner of reaſons, if in any writing brought in juſtice, there be found but one falſification, the whole inſtrument loſeth all its force, and is rejected.

There is another difficulty that deceiveth ſuch men as are not well ſeen in antiquity, to wit, that the words uſed in old time, have now changed their ſignification. In the fathers are found theſe words, of Pope, of Sacrifice, of Oblation, of Purging fire, of Indulgence, of Station, of Species, of Monk, of Penance; but quite in another ſenſe than theſe words are taken at this day.

Notwithſtanding theſe difficulties and diſadvantages, whereby our adverſaries ſtrive to prevail againſt us, we refuſe not for all that to buckle with them. For what falſifications ſoever were made in the books of antient writers, yet in them remain ſtill ſo many expreſs and formal places againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that of the collection of them, a man might make a great volume. We have produced above five hundred in the book of the *Novelty of Popery*; and Mr. le *Faucheur*, and Mr. *Aubertin* have laboured lately, and taken pains about this ſubject, with a moſt exact diligence and full of great learning. Here we will content our ſelves to produce ſome few places for a taſte, yet with this proteſtation, that I do not alledge the Fathers for to be a ſtay to our cauſe, which is ſufficiently propped and eſtabliſhed upon the word of God. God doth not beg the teſtimonies of men. His word is as ſtrong alone, as being accompanied with human teſtimonies. To go about to defend it with the teſtimonies of men ſub-

ject to error, is as if a man would lighten the ſun with a candle. But we do alledge the Fathers for to defend their honour, becauſe that againſt their intent, our adverſaries make them advocates of a bad cauſe: And for to condeſcend and yield ſome thing to the diſeaſe of this froward age, wherein the holy Scripture hath loſt its power and efficacy, and which armeth it ſelf with human teſtimonies againſt the word of God.

CHAP. XXVI. *Places of the Fathers contrary to Tranſubſtantiation, and to the manducation of the body of Chriſt by the corporal mouth.*

TERTULLIAN in his fourth book againſt *Marcion* chapter 40, diſputing againſt the *Marcionites* that denied Chriſt to have a true human body, ſpeaketh thus: § *Chriſt when he had taken the bread and diſtributed it to his diſciples, made it to be his body, ſaying, this is my body, that is to ſay the figure of my body. But it were not a figure, unleſs it were a true body.* His reaſon is, becauſe men repreſent not by figure the things that are not.

And in the third book, chapter 19. ‡ *Chriſt called the bread his body, that thereby thou mighteſt underſtand that he gave to the bread to be the figure of his body.*

Origen upon the fifteenth chapter of St. *Matthew*, ſpeaking of that which the faithful receive by the corporal mouth in the Euchariſt: * *If every thing that entereth into the mouth, goes into the belly, and is ſent into the privy: This food which is ſanctified by the word of God and by the prayer, as it is material, goes into the*

---

§ Acceptum panem & diſtributum diſcipulis corpus ſuum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc eſt corpus meum, id eſt figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuiſſet, niſi veritatis eſſet corpus.

‡ Panem ſuum corpus appellans, ut & hinc jam eum intelligas corporis ſui figuram pani dediſſe.

* Quod ſi quicquid ingreditur in os, in ventrem abit, & in ſeceſſum ejicitur, & ille cibus qui ſanctificatur per verbum Dei, perque obſecrationem, juxta id quod habet materialem ventrem abit & in ſeceſſum emittitur, &c. Et hæc quidem de typico ſymbolicoq; corpore.

belly,

belly, and is ſent into the privy. And a little after, *And thus much he ſaid touching the typical and ſymbolical body of Chriſt.* Upon this place Cardinal du *Perron* writing againſt du *Pleſſis*, maketh many exclamations againſt *Origen*, and calls him *Origin of all errors*, and cries out, *ſhut your ears chriſtian people*, as if men did read with their ears. What Cardinal du *Perron* ſaith, that *Theophilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria* did condemn *Origen* for ſpeaking ſo, is falſe, and ſhall never be found.

Theodoret in his firſt Dialogue titled the *Unchangeable*, ſpeaking of theſe words, *This is my body*, ſaith, † *The Lord hath honoured the viſible ſigns with the appellation of his body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature.*

A little before, he had ſaid, *The Lord gave to the ſign the name of his body.*

And in the ſecond Dialogue termed the *Non confuſe*. *The divine myſteries are ſigns of the true body.* And a little after, he introduceth an *Eutychian* Heretick maintaining Tranſubſtantiation. To whom he anſwereth in theſe words, *Thou art caught by the nets that thou haſt woven. For even after the conſecration, the myſtical ſigns do not change their nature,* ‡ *For they remain in their former ſubſtance, form and figure.* And in the ſame Dialogue, *tell me then, the ſigns that are offered unto God, what ſigns are they of?* The anſwer is, *Of the Lord's body and blood.*

In the Books of Sacraments attributed to S. *Ambroſe*, in the fourth Book, cha. 5. We have a clauſe of the publick form uſed in the Euchariſt, in theſe words, § *Grant that this oblation be imputed unto us, as acceptable, reaſonable, which is the FIGURE of the*

---

† Τὰ σύμβολα τῇ τῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετιμηκεν, ἃ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει χαριν προσθεικώς.

‡ Μένει γας ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας ὐσίας.

§ Dixit Sacerdos. Fac nobis hanc oblationem aſſcriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis & ſanguinis Domini noſtri Jeſus Chriſti.

body and blood of Chriſt Jeſus our Lord. Which cannot be underſtood of the unconſecrated bread, for it is not an acceptable oblation for our ſins. This clauſe is remained in the Maſs, except this word, *Figure*, which they have taken away.

Euſebius in his 12 Book of the *Demonſtration*, chap. 8. * *We have been inſtructed to celebrate at the table, according to the laws of the New Teſtament, by the ſigns of the body and blood, the remembrance of this Sacrifice.* And in the eighth Book, after he had ſaid *that Chriſt delivered to his Diſciples the ſigns or ſymbols of his diſpenſation*, he addeth ** *Commanding to celebrate the Image or figure of his own Body.*

Euphræmius Patriarch of *Antioch*: ‡ *Chriſt's body which the faithful receive, loſeth not its ſenſible ſubſtance, and is not divided from intelligible grace. So Baptiſm being wholly made ſpiritual and one, doth retain the property of its ſenſible ſubſtance, to wit water, and yet loſeth not that which it is made.* This place is very forcible; for he calleth the bread Chriſt's body, and acknowledges not therein any converſion of ſubſtance, and teacheth that in the Euchariſt there is no more converſion of ſubſtance than in Baptiſm where the water remaineth always water.

Gregory Nazianzen in his 2d Oration for the old Paſſover ſpeaketh thus of the participation of the Euchariſt: ‖ *We ſhall indeed be partakers of the Paſſover in figure, though more evidently than in the old Paſſover: For the Paſſover (I dare ſay) was a more dark figure of a figure.*

---

* Τέτε δή τα τῦ θυμάτ☉ τὴν μνήμην ἐπι τραπιζη ικτιλῖιν διὰ συμβόλων τῦ τι σώματ☉ αυτῦ και αἱματος παρειληφότες.

** Τὴν εἰκόνα τῦ ἰδιυ σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακιλευόμενος.

‡ Ex Bibliothe. Photii p. 415. editionis Auguſtanæ. τὸ παρά τῶν πιςῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριςῦ, τῆς ἀισθητῆς ὢν ἐξίςαται, &c.

‖ Μεταληψόμεθα τῦ πάσχα, νῦν μεν τυπικῶς ἔτι, εἰ καὶ τῦ παλαιῦ γνωριμώτερον. τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα (τολμῶ καὶ λέγειν) τύπυ ἦν τυπ☉ αἰμυδρότερ☉.

And

And the ſame Father in his Oration in the praiſe of his Siſter *Gorgonia*, commendeth her devotion, in that having received with her own hand the Sacrament, ſhe carried back home a parcel of it. * *If* (ſaith he) *her hand had ſhut up as in a treaſure any thing of the ſigns or antitypes of the body or of the blood of the Lord, ſhe mingled it with her tears.*

Euphræmius Deacon of *Ediſſa*: *Behold* † *diligently how the Lord after he had taken the bread in his hands, bleſſed it, and brake it, in figure of his immaculate body, and bleſſed the cup in figure of his precious blood, and gave it to his Diſciples.*

The imperfect work upon St. *Matthew* attributed to *Chryſoſtome*, in the eleventh Homily, ſpeaking of thoſe that employ the ſacred veſſels, as Plates and Chalices, to profane uſes: ‡ *If it be ſo dangerous a thing to tranſport to private uſes the ſacred veſſels wherein Chriſt's body is not, but where the myſtery of his body is contained, how much more the veſſels of our bodies which God hath prepared to himſelf for to dwell in them?* Note that he doth not ſay that the body of Chriſt *was not* in theſe veſſels, but that *it is not in them*, that it may not be thought he ſpeaketh of the veſſels of *Solomon*'s Temple.

Saint *Hierom* § in his ſecond Book againſt *Jovinian*: *Our Lord for a type of his blood hath not offered water but wine.* And the Commentary upon the firſt to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 11. attributed to Saint *Hierom*: ‖ *Chriſt*

---

* Εἰ πῶ τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῦ τιμιυ σώματ☉ ἢ αἵματ☉ ἢ χειρ ἐθησαυρισεν, &c.

† Ad eos, qui Filii Dei naturam ſcrutari volunt. Inſpice diligenter, quomodo ſumens in manibus panem. benedixit ac fregit in figuram immaculati corporis, &c. ‡ Si hæc vaſa ſanctificata ad privatos uſus transferre ſic periculoſum eſt, in quibus non eſt verum corpus Chriſti, ſed myſterium corporis ejus continetur, quanto magis vaſa corporis noſtri? &c. § In typum ſanguinis ſui non obtulit aquam, ſed vinum. ‖ Chriſtus ultimam nobis commemorationem, ſive memoriam dereliquit. Quemadmodum ſi quis peregre proficiſcens, aliquod pignus ei quem diligit deteſtinquat.

left us a laſt remembrance, as if any man going a journey, ſhould leave ſome token to one that he loveth.

Saint *Auſtin* in the 12th Chapter againſt *Adimantus*: ‡ *The Lord made no difficulty to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the ſign of his body.*

And in the 23d Epiſtle to *Bonifacius*, after he hath brought many examples of figurative kind of ſpeeches, as when two days before *Eaſter* we ſay, *Chriſt dyed this day:* and when on the Sunday we ſay *Chriſt is riſen this day*, becauſe thoſe days are deſtinated for to celebrate the remembrance of the Lord's Paſſion and Reſurrection, he addeth, that after the ſame kind of ſpeaking, we ſay that Chriſt is ſtill ſacrificed. Here be his words: ‖ *Was not Chriſt once ſacrificed in himſelf? and yet in the Sacrament, not only at every ſolemnity of Eaſter, but alſo every day he is ſacrificed to the People: and he tells no lie who being examined, anſwereth that he is Sacrificed.* Mark that this good Doctor teacheth that Chriſt is ſacrificed every day in the ſame manner as every Sunday he is riſen, and as he dies every *Friday* before *Eaſter*, not really, but by commemoration.

He addeth, § *For if the ſacred ſigns had not ſome reſemblance of the things whereof they be ſacred ſigns, they would not be ſacred ſigns at all: But becauſe of that reſemblance, they take the name of the things themſelves. Even then as in ſome manner the ſacred ſign of the body of Chriſt is Chriſt's body, and the ſacred ſign of his blood, his blood, So the Sacrament of the*

---

‡ Dominus non dubitavit dicere Hoc eſt corpus meum, cum daret ſignum corporis ſui. ‖ Nonne ſemel Chriſtus immolatus eſt in ſe ipſo? & tamen in Sacramento non tantùm per omnes Paſchæ ſolemnitates, ſed omni die populis immolatur: nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, eum reſponderit immolari. § Si enim Sacramenta quándam ſimilitudinem illarum rerum quarum Sacramenta ſunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non eſſent. Ex hoc autem ſimilitudine plerumque ipſarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo ſecundùm quendam modum Sacramentum corporis Chriſti corpus Chriſti eſt, ita Sacramentum fidei fides eſt.

Faith

Faith (to wit Baptiſm) is the Faith. Theſe words no doubt, grieve our Adverſaries heart: For what can a man ſay more expreſs? Would they ſuffer a man that ſhould ſay that the conſecrated hoſt is in a manner the body of Chriſt? Or that it is Chriſt's body in the ſame manner as Chriſt dieth every *Friday* before *Eaſter?* and in the ſame faſhion as Baptiſm is Faith? and a ſacred ſign that taketh the name of the thing ſignified?

The ſame Father upon the third Pſalm: ‡ *The Lord admitted* Judas *to the banquet, in which he recommended and gave to his diſciples the figure of his body and blood.*

The ſame, in his third Book of *Chriſtian Doctrine,* Chapter 16. *When the Lord ſaith,* § *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you, he ſeemeth to command a wicked thing or heinous offence. It is therefore a figure, that commands to communicate to the Paſſion of the Lord, and to put ſweetly and profitably into our memory, that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* Note that Saint *Auſtin* ſaith not only that theſe words *Except ye eat, &c.* are figurative: But alſo expounds unto us the ſenſe and meaning of that figure, ſaying, that it ſignifieth we muſt meditate with pleaſure and profit, that Chriſt is dead for us. Which is an expoſition our Adverſaries approve not.

The ſame Author in the firſt Treatiſe upon the firſt Epiſtle of Saint *John:* † *The Lord comforteth us, we that can handle him no more with our hands, but touch him by Faith.*

---

‡ Dominus Judam adhibuit ad convivium in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis commendavit & tradidit. § Niſi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis & biberitis ſanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis; facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo eſt præcipiens paſſioni Dominicæ eſſe communicandum & ſuaviter atque utiliter in memoria recondendum quòd caro ejus pro nobis crucifixa & vulnerata ſit. † Dominus conſolans nos, qui ipſum jam in cælo ſedentem manu contrectare non poſſumus, ſed fide contingere.

And in the 53d Sermon of the words of the Lord: ‡ *All almoſt do call the body of Chriſt that which is the ſacred ſign of it:* Words that are very conſiderable.

And in the 27th Treatiſe upon Saint *John:* § *The Capernaits thought he ſhould diſtribute his body unto them; but he ſaid unto them he would aſcend into heaven whole indeed. When ye ſee the Son of Man aſcend where he was before, certainly then at leaſt, you ſhall ſee that he giveth not his body as you eſteem. Verily then ſhall ye underſtand that his grace is not conſumed with biting.*

Chiefly that place of the ſame Father upon the 98 Plaſm, ſeems to me very expreſs, where expounding theſe words of the Lord, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you,* he bringeth in the Lord ſpeaking thus: † *Underſtand ſpiritually what I have ſaid unto you, ye ſhall not eat this body that you ſee, nor drink that blood which ſhall be ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucify me. I have commended a ſacred ſign unto you, which being underſtood ſpiritually, ſhall vivify you.*

According to our Adverſaries doctrine, both good and bad take the Lord's body in the Euchariſt. For many be partakers of the Sacrament without Faith and hypocritically. Such nevertheleſs, do ſwallow the conſecrated hoſt, and (if we believe our Adverſaries) eat truly and really the body of Chriſt Jeſus. Saint *Auſtin* impugneth that opinion, and maintaineth that the wicked eat but the ſigns and receive not Chriſt.

---

‡ Pene quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt. § Illi putabant cum erogaturum corpus ſuum, ille addixit ſe aſcenſurum in cœlum utique integrum. Cum videritis filium hominis aſcendentem ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis, erogat corpus ſuum. Certe vel tunc intelligetis quod ejus gratia non conſumitur morſibus. † Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus ſum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis, & bibituri illum ſanguinem quem ſuſuri ſunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, ſpiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.

In the 26th Treatiſe upon Saint *John*, † *Whoſoever dwelleth not in Chriſt, and in whom Chriſt dwelleth not, for a certain he eateth not his fleſh ſpiritually, and drinketh not his blood, though he preſſeth carnally and viſibly with his teeth the ſacred ſigns of Chriſt's body and blood.* And in the Book of *Sentences* of Saint *Auſtin* collected by *Proſper*: * *Whoſoever diſcordeth with Chriſt, eateth not the fleſh of Chriſt, and drinketh not his blood, though he take every day indifferently the ſacred ſign of ſo great a thing, to the condemnation of his own preſumption.*

And in the 25th Chapter of the 21ſt Book *of the City of God*, § *It muſt not be ſaid that he who is not in the body of Chriſt, eateth the body of Chriſt.* And there he bringeth in Chriſt ſaying, ‖ *He that abideth not in me, and in whom I abide not, let not him ſay nor think that he eateth my body or drinketh my blood. Therefore thoſe do not abide in Chriſt, that are not the members of Chriſt.*

Saint *Hierom* ſaith the ſame, upon the laſt Chapter of *Eſaiah*: §§ *Whilſt they are not holy in body and ſpirit, they eat not the fleſh of Jeſus, and drink not that blood whereof he ſpeaketh himſelf, Whoſoever eateth my fleſh, &c.*

Let no man wonder that I have turned this word, Sacrament, in Saint *Auſtin*, by a ſacred ſign: ſeeing that he himſelf expoundeth it ſo in the fifth epiſtle to *Marcellinus*: ** *The ſigns, when they belong to divine*

---

† Qui non manet in Chriſto, & in quo non manet Chriſtus, proculdubio nec manducat ſpiritualiter carnem ejus nec bibit ejus ſanguinem licet carnaliter & viſibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum corporis et ſanguinis Chriſti. * Sent. 339. Qui diſcordat à Chriſto, non carnem ejus manducat nec ſanguinem bibit, etiamſi tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium ſuæ præſumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat. § Non dicendum, eum manducare corpus Chriſti qui in corpore Chriſti non eſt. ‖ Qui non in me manet, et in quo ego non maneo, non ſe dicat aut exiſtimet manducare corpus meum, &c. §§ Dum non ſunt ſancti corpore et ſpiritu, non comedunt carnem Jeſu, neque bibunt ſanguinem. ** Signa cum ad res divinas pertinent, Sacramenta appellantur.

things,

things, are called Sacraments. And in the tenth book of the city of God, Chapter 5. ‡ *The viſible Sacrifice is a Sacrament of the inviſible Sacrifice, that is to ſay, a ſacred ſign.* And againſt the adverſary of the law and the prophets, 2 Book, Chapter 9. *Sacramenta, id eſt ſacra ſigna, The Sacraments, that is to ſay, the ſacred ſigns.* It is the definition given by *Lombard* in the firſt diſtinction of the fourth Book, Tit. 3, *Sacramentum eſt ſacræ rei ſignum. Bellarmin* himſelf in his firſt Book of Sacraments, * Chapter 7, & 11. *The word* Sacrament *ſignifieth a ſign of a ſacred or ſecret thing.*

In one thing principally it appeareth how far Saint *Auſtin* was from believing Tranſubſtantiation: In that in theſe words, *This is my body*, by this word *Body* he underſtandeth the *Church.* At the end of *Fulgentius* his works, who was *Auſtin*'s diſciple, there is a Sermon of *Auſtin*'s which maliciouſly they have plucked out of his works, and that had been loſt, if *Fulgentius* and *Beda* had not preſerved it. Here then be the very words of *Auſtin:* † *What ye have ſeen, is bread and wine, as your eyes ſhew unto you; but according to the inſtruction that your faith demandeth, the bread is the body of Chriſt, and the cup is his blood.* *Bellarmin* in his firſt book of the Euchariſt, Chapter 1. acknowledgeth that theſe words, *This bread is Chriſt's body*, cannot be true if they be not taken figuratively. But let us learn how Saint *Auſtin* will have the bread to be the body of Chriſt. He ſaith then, § *How*

‡ Sacrificium viſibile eſt inviſibilis Sacrificii Sacramentum, id eſt ſacrum ſignum. * Sacramentum nomen genericum ſignificat ſignum rei ſacræ vel arcanæ. † Aug. Serm. ad infantes. Quod vidiſtis, panis eſt et calix, quod vobis etiam oculi veſtri renuntiant; quod autem fides veſtra poſtulat inſtruenda, panis eſt corpus Chriſti § Quomodo eſt panis corpus ejus & calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo eſt ſanguis ejus? Iſta fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, formam habet corporalem: quod intelligitur fructum habet ſpiritualem. Corpus ergo Chriſti ſi vis intelligere, audi Apoſtolum dicentem fidelibus, Vos eſtis corpus Chriſti et membra, &c.

is the bread his body? and how is the Cup his blood? Theſe things Brethren, are called Sacraments, becauſe in them one thing is ſeen, and another is underſtood. What is ſeen, hath a corporal form: What is meant hath a ſpiritual fruit. If then thou wilt underſtand what the body of Chriſt is, hear the Apoſtle ſaying to the faithful, Ye are Chriſt's body and his members. If ye be therefore Chriſt's body and members, your myſtery is ſet on the table of the Lord, &c. He giveth the ſame expoſition in the 26th treatiſe upon Saint *John. By this meat and by this drink, the Lord will have to be underſtood the ſociety and fellowſhip of his body and of his members, to wit the holy Church of the Predeſtinate.*

And in the *Roman* Canon, in the 2d diſtinction of the conſecration at the Canon, *Hoc eſt:* * *The heavenly bread which is the fleſh of Chriſt, is after its manner called the body of Chriſt, although to ſpeak truly it be the ſacred ſign of Chriſt's body, to wit of that which being viſible, palpable, mortal, was put upon the Croſs.* And thereupon the gloſs of the doctors hath theſe words, which truly are excellent: *The heavenly Sacrament that repreſenteth truly the fleſh of Chriſt, is called the body of Chriſt, but improperly, for it is thus called after its manner, but not according to the truth of the thing, but by a ſignificant myſtery. So that the ſenſe is, that it is called the body of Chriſt, that is to ſay, that it is ſignified.*

S. *Cyprian* in his 63 Epiſtle will have in the ſacred cup water to be mingled with the wine. His reaſon is becauſe that as the wine is the blood of Chriſt, ſo the water is the people: and that the people ought

* Cæleſtis panis, qui Chriſti caro eſt, ſuo modo vocatur corpus Chriſti, cum re vera ſit ſacramentum corporis Chriſti illius: videlicet quod palpabile, mortale in cruce poſitum eſt. Et ib. Gloſ. Cœleſte Sacramentum quod vere repræſentat Chriſti carnem dicitur corpus Chriſti, ſed improprie verum dicitur ſuo modo ſed non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio. Ut ſit ſenſus, vocatur Chriſti corpus, id eſt ſignificatur,

not

not to be divided from Chriſt. * *If* (ſaith he) *any one offereth nothing but wine, Chriſt's blood beginneth to be without us, but if the water be alone, the people begin to be without Chriſt.* Whereby it followeth, that as *Cyprian* did not believe that the water was tranſubſtantiated into the people: ſo did he not believe that the Wine was tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt.

And in the ſame Epiſtle: ‡ *That which Chriſt called his blood, was wine.* And in the 76th Epiſtle: † *The Lord called his body the bread, compounded with the gathering together of many grains.*

We have a treatiſe of the two natures of Chriſt, againſt *Neſtorius* and *Euthyches*, made by Pope *Gelaſius*, who wrote about the year of our Lord 495. There, is this ſentence to be found, which vexeth and grieves mightily our adverſaries: ‖ *Certainly the Sacraments that we take of the body and blood of Chriſt, are a divine thing, for which cauſe alſo by them we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the ſubſtance or nature of the bread and wine ceaſeth not to be. And verily the Image and ſimilitude of the body and blood of Chriſt, is celebrated in the action of the myſteries.* Note that he diſputed againſt the *Eutychians*, who held that the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt was paſſed and changed into the ſubſtance of the divine nature. The controverſy was not about the converſion of the accidents, but of the ſubſtance, which *Gelaſius* maintaineth to remain in the body of the Lord, as the ſubſtance of the bread remaineth in the Sacrament. Now, no man can doubt but that this

---

* §. 9. Quando in Calice vino aqua miſcetur, Chriſto populus adunatur, &c. Si vinum tantum quis offerat, ſanguis Chriſti incipit eſſe ſine nobis: ſi vero aqua ſit ſola, plebs incipit eſſe ſine Chriſto. ‡ Vinum fuit quod ſanguinem ſuum dixit. † Dominus corpus ſuum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congeſtum. ‖ Certe Sacramenta quæ ſumimus corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, divina res eſt: propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur conſortes naturæ, & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia panis & vini. Et certe imago & ſimilitudo corporis et ſanguinis Chriſti in actione myſteriorum celebrantur.

Book be of *Gelaſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, ſeeing that *Fulgentius* who lived in *Gelaſius*'s time, alledgeth it * in his book to *Ferrandus* the deacon, in the 2d propoſition: and attributeth it to the Pope *Gelaſius*.

Fulgentius, Diſciple to S. *Auſtin*, in his ſecond Book to *Traſimondus*, chap. 17. † *How is Chriſt aſcended into Heaven, but becauſe he is in a place, and a man indeed? Or how is he preſent to his faithful ones, but becauſe he is infinite and a God indeed?*

Again, in his Book of the faith to *Peter* the *Deacon*, chap. 19. ‡ *The holy Catholick Church which is over all the world now, that is to ſay under the New Teſtament, ceaſeth not to offer unto Chriſt Jeſus, with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt with whom he is one and the ſame Godhead, a Sacrifice of bread and wine, in Faith and Charity. For in thoſe carnal oblations* [of the Old Teſtament] *there was a figure of Chriſt's fleſh, which he was to offer for our ſins, being without ſin. But in the ſacrifice* [of the Euchariſt] *is made an action of thankſgiving, and a remembrance of the fleſh of Chriſt which he offered for us, and of the blood that himſelf who is God, hath ſhed for us.* Beſides this, that he calleth the Holy Supper a remembrance, and a Sacrifice of bread and wine: It is very remarkable that he ſaith, that this Sacrifice of bread and wine is offered unto Chriſt Jeſus. Whereby it appeareth that this Sacrifice is not Chriſt himſelf: For Chriſt is not Sacrificed unto Chriſt.

Facundus an *African* Biſhop, who wrote about the year of our Lord 550 in the defence of three heads

---

* Hoc etiam beatæ memoriæ Papa Gelaſius, &c. in eo libro quem memoratus Antiſtes conſcripſit adverſus eos qui in Domino Jeſu duarum naturarum nolunt indiviſam credere veritatem. † Quomodo aſcendit in cælum, niſi quia localis et verus eſt homo? aut quomodo adeſt fidelibus ſuis, niſi quia idem immenſus et verus deus? ‡ Cui nunc id eſt tempore novi Teſtamenti cum Patre et Sp. Sancto, cum quibus illi eſt una divinitas, ſacrificium panis et vini in fide et charitate ſancta Eccleſia Catholica per univerſum orbem terræ offerre non ceſſat, &c.

or points of the Council of *Chalcedon*: * 'The Sacrament of Adoption [*to wit baptiſm*] may be called 'the Adoption, even as we call the Sacrament of his 'body and blood which is in the bread and in the con'ſecrated Cup, his body and blood: Not that, to 'to ſpeak properly, the bread is his body, and the 'Cup his blood: But becauſe they contain in them 'the myſtery of his body and blood.' This Book of *Facundus*, drawn out of the *Vatican* Library, was publiſhed by *Jacobus Sirmondus* a Jeſuit, who for this cauſe was ſuſpected. And I hear he hath been in trouble about it. § *Turrianus* and *Valquez*, and *Gregory* of *Valentia*, Jeſuits, object unto themſelves a place of *Chryſoſtome* in his Epiſtle to *Cæſarius*: which Epiſtle alſo is in *Biblioth. Patr.* Printed at *Colen*, anno 1618, in the 8 Tome. That place is ſuch: 'Afore 'the bread be ſanctified, we call it bread: But the 'divine grace ſanctifying it by the means of the Prieſt, 'it is freed indeed from the appellation of bread, and 'is honoured with the name of the body of the Lord, 'though the nature of bread remain in it.' Theſe Jeſuits anſwer that this place is not of *John Chryſoſtome*, but of another *John* of *Conſtantinople*. Which they ſay without proof. Yet it matters not, for it ſufficeth they acknowledge that place to be of an ancient author.

The eight Books of *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* attributed to *Clement* the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, are not of him: Nevertheleſs theſe Books are ancient, and there

---

* Poteſt Sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari, ſicut Sacramentum corporis & ſanguinis ejus quod eſt in pane & poculo conſecrato corpus ejus & ſanguinem dicimus non quod proprie corpus ejus ſit panis, & poculum ſanguis: ſed quod in ſe myſterium corporis ejus ſanguiniſque contineant, &c.

§ Turrian. li. 1. de Euchariſt. c. 18. §. Ad illud. Vaſq. in 3 part. Thomæ Tomo 3. Diſ. 180. c. 9. pag. 107. Greg. de Val. lib. de Tranſ. c. 7. Sicut enim antequam ſanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum ſanctificante gratia, mediante ſacerdote, liberatus quidem eſt ab appellatione panis, & dignus habitus eſt Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamſi natura panis in eo remanſit.

is much good to be learned in them. In the 5th Book, chap. 16. it is ſaid, that † 'Chriſt having given the 'figurative myſteries of his body and blood, went to 'the mount of Olives.' And in the 7th Book, chap. 26. § 'We give thee thanks for the precious blood 'of Chriſt, which was ſhed for us, and for the pre-'cious body, whereof we perform the ſigns by his 'command, for to ſhew forth his death.'

There would never be an end if we ſhould gather up all the places of the ancient Fathers, wherein they ſay that that which we receive in the Euchariſt is bread, and that the bread and wine are ſigns, ſymbols, figures and antitypes of the body and blood of the Lord; I will add but two Canons of a Council which are very formal.

The 24 Canon of the III Council of *Carthage* is ſuch: * 'Let nothing be offered in the ſacred ſervice 'but the body and blood of the Lord, (as alſo the 'Lord hath ordained it) that is to ſay, nothing, but 'bread and wine mingled with water.' The ſame Canon is found repeated in the very ſame words in the Council of *Trull*, in the Canon 32, as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin* Copies. Upon which Canon, *Balſamon* maketh this Commentary: 'The two and 'thirtieth Canon of the Council of *Trull* hath ordai-'ned very at large, ‡ that the non-bloody Sacrifice 'ſhould be made with bread and wine mingled with

† Cum vero antitypa myſteria pretioſi Corporis & ſanguinis ſui nobis tradidiſſet.

§ Etiam agimus gratias tibi, Pater, pro pretioſo ſanguine Jeſu Chriſti qui effuſus eſt pro nobis, et pro pretioſo corpore cujus hæc Antitypa perficimus.

* Ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου προσενέχηται, ὡς καὶ κύριος αὐτὸς παρέδωκε, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον ὕδατι μεμιγμένον.

‡ Γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν μετὰ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου μεμιγμένου ὕδατι, ὡς τοῦ μὲν ἄρτου τύπον ἐχούσης τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος, τοῦ δὲ οἴνου τύπον τοῦ αἵματος.

'water,

'water, becauſe that the bread is the figure of the 'body of the Lord, and the wine the figure of his 'blood.' Here is then above two hundred Biſhops gathered in a council, that interpret theſe words, 'The body and blood of Chriſt, by the bread and 'wine mingled with water.'

The ſame Council in the 23d Canon ordaineth, that 'when a man officiates at the Altar, the Prayer muſt 'always be directed to the Father.' Whence appeareth manifeſtly that then they worſhipped not the Sacrament, ſeeing that the Council forbiddeth when men aſſiſt at the Altar, to addreſs their Prayers to Chriſt. If this hoſt be Chriſt, it muſt be worſhipped, and by conſequence invocated.

And that it may appear how lately this opinion of Tranſubſtantiation was received: in the Tome *de Divinis officiis*, which is in *Biblioth. Patr.* we have an Epiſtle of that Great Emperor *Carolus Magnus*, where he ſaith, ‡ 'Chriſt ſupping with his Diſciples, brake 'bread, and gave them likewiſe the Cup, in figure 'of his body and blood.' This Epiſtle happily might be written about the year of our Lord 800.

Walefridus Strabo, who wrote about the year 850, in his book of Eccleſiaſtical things, chap. 16. ‖ 'The 'Lord, at the laſt Supper he made with his Diſciples 'afore he was betrayed, after he had made an end of 'the ſolemnity of the antient Paſſover, gave to his 'Diſciples the ſacred ſigns of his body and blood in 'the SUBSTANCE of the bread and wine, and 'taught them to celebrate them in remembrance of 'his moſt holy Paſſion.'

Rupertus Abbot of *Deutſch*, near *Colen*, who lived in the year 1112. and whoſe works are yet extant,

---

‡ Chriſtus cœnando cum diſcipulis panem fregit, & calicem pariter eis dedit in figuram corporis & ſanguinis ſui.

‖ In cœna quam ante traditionem ſuam ultimam cum diſcipulis habuit poſt Paſchæ veteris ſolemnia corporis & ſanguinis ſui Sacramenta in panis et vini ſubſtantia eiſdem diſcipulis ſuis tradidit, et ea in commemorationem ſanctiſſimæ ſuæ paſſionis celebrare perdocuit.

hath

hath condemned tranſubſtantiation, and taught that the ſubſtance of bread remaineth after the Conſecration. Here are his words upon the 12 chap. of *Exodus*: * 'Even as Chriſt neither changed nor deſtroyed the 'human nature, but joined himſelf to it: So in the 'Sacrament he neither deſtroyeth nor changeth the 'ſubſtance of the bread and wine, but joineth himſelf 'to it in the unity of his body and blood.' This place of *Rupertus* is alledged by *Salmeron* in the 16th Treatiſe of the IX. Tome, § *Ruit*, and *Bellarmin* in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical writers, alledges out of him many ſuch like places, and blameth him for it.

To ſo many places that ſay, that the ſubſtance of the bread remaineth after the conſecration, our adverſaries do reply, that by the word of *Subſtance*, the Fathers underſtand the *Accidents*. As it is a great abſurdity by the word of *Accidents*, to underſtand the Subſtance: So is it as great an abſurdity by the word of *Suſtance* to underſtand Accidents. If it may be lawful for them to wreſt the Fathers thus, and when they ſay a thing is white, underſtand that they mean black: never will there be any thing clear nor ſure. Certainly, if by this word Subſtance, the Fathers had underſtood the Accidents, they would have ſaid the *Subſtances* in the plural. For Accidents are many: Among which our adverſaries muſt chuſe one, that may be called a Subſtance. But *Theodoret* in his ſecond Dialogue, ſaying that 'the bread after the Con-'ſecration remaineth in its former ſubſtance, form 'and figure, refuteth this evaſion.' For he diſtinguiſheth expreſly the Subſtance from the Accidents.

Now, as this error of the bodily preſence of Chriſt's body under the *ſpecies* of the bread, began to be ſet on broach: *Bertram* a Prieſt, in *Charles* the *Bald* his time, about the year of our Lord 870. made a Book

---

* Rup. Tuitienſis in Exo. 12. Sicut Chriſtus humanam naturam nec mutavit, nec deſtruxit, ſed aſſumpſit, ita in Sacramento, nec deſtruit nec mutat ſubſtantiam panis, & vini, ſed aſſumit in unitatem corporis et ſanguinis ſui.

againſt

againſt that abuſe, which Book is yet extant. For which cauſe alſo *Bellarmin* in his firſt Book of the Euchariſt, chap. 1. placeth him among the Heretick‹s. But *Bertram*, all his life time, lived with credit and honour, and was never reproved for it.

CHAP. XXVII. *Confirmation of the ſame, by the cuſtoms of the antient Church.*

THIS truth is confirmed by the antient cuſtoms different from what is done in the Maſs at this day, and incompatible with Tranſubſtantiation. For in the antient church, ſervice was ſaid in a known tongue. Every one received the communion in both kinds.

The people offered upon the table abundance of bread and wine, and not round and light wafers * The people, as well men as women, received the Sacrament with their hand, and many carried it home along with them. ‡ The reſidues of the ſacred bread that remained upon the table after the Communion, were either burnt or † given unto little children coming from ſchool, or carried into the Prieſt's houſes, for to be eaten there. Then were there no private Maſſes, Nor no *Corpus Chriſti* day. The conſecrated hoſt was not carried in proceſſion. § *Ambroſe* in his book of Widows, ſaith that the Widows were employed in the adminiſtration of the ſacrament. ‖ In the Roman order which is in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, theſe words are to be found: *Let the Virgin receive the Communion af-*

---

* Cypr. Serm. de Lapſis. Euſeb. Hiſtor. lib. 7. c. 9. Theod. Hiſtor. lib. 5. cap. 18. Nazianz. Orat. de Gorgonia.

‡ Heſychius lib. 2. in Lev. c. 8. Ivo 2 part. 2. de Sacr. c. 59. Barch. l. 5. c. 12.

† Evagr. l. 4. cap 36.

§ Amb. l. de Viduis. Oportet eam [Viduam] promo carere variarum illecebris voluptatum, vitare internum corporis animiq; languorem, ut corporis & ſanguinem Chriſti miniſtret.

‖ Editionis Pariſienſis anno 1624 colum. 161. Virgo poſtquam communicavit, reſervet de ipſa communione unde uſque ad diem octavum communicet.

ter

ter the Maſs is ended, and after ſhe hath received, let her reſerve of the Communion ſufficiently for to communicate eight days together. Had they then believed the Tranſubſtantiation, they would never have given unto maids the Sacrament to keep ſo long a time.

Certain it is the antient Church worſhipped not the Sacrament. There may be found indeed ſome places of the Fathers that ſay that in the Euchariſt we worſhip Chriſt: But it is one thing to worſhip Chriſt in the action of the Sacrament, and another thing to worſhip the Sacrament. The Father and the Holy Ghoſt in the Euchariſt are alſo worſhipped.

In vain do they alledge ſome antient Fathers that ſpeak of the elevation of the Sacrament. For the elevation inferreth not neceſſarily adoration. Seeing that in *Moſes's* law the Prieſt ‖ waved the breaſt and ſhoulder of the offering, and a handful of the firſt fruits, without worſhipping theſe things. Moreover, that elevation was nothing like to the elevation of the hoſt which the Prieſt maketh now a days over his head, turning his back to the people, and ringing a little bell. But then after the Prieſt had uncovered the bread and wine, he took the platter or diſh with both his hands, and lift it up, for to ſhew it unto the people, and that even before the words which are called of Conſecration.

CHAP. XXVIII. *Explanation of the places of of the Fathers that ſay that in the Euchariſt we eat the body and blood of Chriſt, and that the bread is changed into the body of Chriſt, and is made Chriſt's body. Specially of Ambroſe, Hillary, and Chryſoſtome. That the Fathers ſpeak of ſeveral kinds of body and blood of Chriſt.*

THE holy ſcripture ſpeaketh of three ſorts of body of Chriſt. Namely, of the natural body of Chriſt, which he took in the womb of the *Virgin*

‖ Exod. 29. 24. Levitic. 8. 27. & 29. Numb. 5. 25.

Mary

Mary, and of his myſtical body, which is the Church, and of his ſacramental or commemorative body, which is the bread of the holy ſupper: As we have ſhewed already.

The fathers following the ſtile of the Scripture, beſides Chriſt's myſtical body which is the Church, ſpeak of two bodies of Chriſt, to wit, of his natural body, and of his ſymbolical and ſacramental body: Of which body they ſpake as of a divine thing and full of myſteries: And of a ſpiritual fleſh, which is made by the ineffable power of God, by the means and for the cauſes which I ſhall relate hereafter. Likewiſe alſo they make two kinds of blood of Chriſt; the one natural, the other myſtical and divine, which we receive in the ſacrament.

Clement Alexandrinus in his ſecond book of the *Pedagogue*, chap. 2. **There are two ſorts of blood of Chriſt, the one is his carnal blood by which we are redeemed from corruption. The other is ſpiritual, to wit, that by which we are anointed: And that is to drink the blood of Jeſus, to be partaker of the Lord's incorruption.*

St. *Hierome*, upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* ‡ *Chriſt's fleſh is meant or underſtood in two manners, either that ſpiritual and divine fleſh of which he ſaith himſelf, My fleſh is meat indeed, Or elſe that fleſh that was crucified, and that blood which was ſhed by the ſpear of the ſoldier.* This place is alledged in the *Roman Decree* in the ſecond diſtinction of the conſecration, at the canon *Dupliciter*.

And in the ſame diſtinction at the canon § *De hac*, the ſame father is alledged upon *Leviticus*, in theſe

---

* Διτλὸν αἷμα τῦ κυρίυ, τὸ μὶν γάρ ἐςιν αὐτῦ σαρκικὸν ᾧ τῆ φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα, τὸ δὶ πνευματικόν.

‡ Ex Hieron in Epiſt. ad Epheſ. ca. 1. Diſt. 2. de Conſe. Can. Dupliciter. Dupliciter intelligitur caro Chriſti vel ſpiritualis illa atque divina de qua ipſe ait, Caro mea vere eſt cibus, vel caro quæ crucifixa eſt, & ſanguinis qui militis effuſus eſt lanceam.

§ De hac quidem hoſtia, quæ in commemorationem mirabiliter fit, edere licet. De illa vero quam Chriſtus in ara crucis obtulit ſecundùm ſe nulli edere licet.

words.

words. *It is indeed lawful to eat of this hoſt, which is made admirably in remembrance of Chriſt. But it is not lawful in itſelf for any one to eat of that which he offered on the altar of the Croſs.*

And in the ſame place, at the canon *Corpus*, taken out of St. *Auſtin* : † *We do call body and blood of Chriſt, that which being taken of the fruits of the earth, is conſecrated by the myſtical prayer.* Certainly, a body of Chriſt taken of the fruits of the earth, is not the body of Chriſt crucified for us.

Tertullian in the ſixth chapter of his book of prayer: ‖ *The bread is the word of the living God which is deſcended from heaven.* Item, *the body that is holden to be in the bread: This is my body.*

Euſebius of *Ceſarea* in his third book of Eccleſiaſtical Divinity, chapter 12. * *The Lord ſpoke not of the fleſh which he took, but of his myſtical body and blood.*

St. *Auſtin* calleth very often that which we receive in the holy ſupper, the body of Chriſt. But that we may not think that that which we receive by the corporal mouth is that body of the Lord which was crucified for us, he bringeth in Chriſt ſaying unto us, ‡ *Ye ſhall not eat this body that you ſee, and ſhall not drink the blood ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucify me. What then? I have* (ſaith he) *recommended a Sacrament unto you, which being taken ſpiritually, ſhall quicken and vivify you.*

St. *Ambroſe* in his Commentary upon St. *Luke*, maketh a plain difference between theſe two kinds of body of Chriſt, expounding the words of the Lord,

---

† Corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti dicimus illud quod de fructibus terræ acceptum & prece myſtica conſecratum, &c.

‖ Panis eſt Sermo Dei vivi, qui deſcendit de cœlis. Tum quod & corpus ejus in pane cenſetur. Hoc eſt corpus meum.

* Οὐ περὶ ἧς ἀνείληφε σαρκὸς διελέγετο περὶ δὲ τοῦ μυϛικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος.

‡ In Pſal 38. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis, neque bibituri illum ſanguinem quem fuſuri ſunt qui me crucifigent, Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, ſpiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.

Luke 17. *Whereſoever the body is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together.* Firſt he ſaith that by the body may be underſtood the dead body of Chriſt, and by the eagles which are about it, *Mary* wife to *Cleopas*, and *Mary Magdalen*, and *Mary* mother of the Lord: Then he addeth, *There is alſo that body of whom it is ſaid, My fleſh is meat indeed.*

Pope *Innocent* the third in the fourth book of the Myſteries of the Maſs, chapter 36. diſtinguiſheth in expreſs terms theſe two kinds of fleſh or body of Chriſt, ſaying, *The form of the bread comprehendeth both the one and the other fleſh of Chriſt, to wit, the true, and the myſtical.*

Salmeron the Jeſuit in his fifteenth Treatiſe of the IX Tome, gathereth the ſame diſtinction of two ſorts of blood of Chriſt, out of the book of the Lord's ſupper attributed to St. *Cyprian*. *Why* (ſaith he) *in the law it was forbidden to eat blood, and it is commanded in the Goſpel: Cyprian teacheth it excellently well in his book of the Lord's ſupper. For in the abſtinence of that blood is deſigned the ſpiritual and reaſonable life, far from brutiſh manners. † Now we drink of Chriſt's blood, both of that which is human, and of that which is divine. To the end we may underſtand that in taſting of him we are called to the participation of eternal and divine life.*

We have in the former chapter alledged *Euphræmius* calling the bread of the Euchariſt *the body* of Chriſt, and yet ſaying that *that body loſeth not the ſubſtance of bread.* And the canon *Hoc eſt* in the ſecond diſtinction of the conſecration, drawn out of St. *Auſtin*, ſaying, that *the bread which is the fleſh of Chriſt, is after its manner called the body of Chriſt, though indeed it is the ſacred ſign of the body of Chriſt.* And St. *Auſtin*, *The Lord made no difficulty to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the ſign of his body.* And *Theodoret* like-

† Bibimus verò de Chriſti ſanguine humano pariter ac divino, ut intelligamus per ejus guſtum ad æternæ ac divinæ vitæ participium nos vocatos.

wiſe,

wiſe, ſaying, *The Lord hath given to the ſign the name of his body.* And *Origen*, calling the bread of the ſupper *a figurative body of Chriſt.*

The ſame appeareth more clear than the very day, in that the Fathers which ſay that in the Euchariſt we eat Chriſt's body, attribute unto this body things which cannot agree with the natural body of Chriſt born of the Virgin *Mary*, and crucified for us. St. *Cyprian* § in his 76 Epiſtle ſaith: *The Lord calleth the bread his body which is made and compoſed of many grains.* And in the 63 Epiſtle. ‖ *The Lord's body cannot be of the flower alone, or of the water alone, except both the one and the other be kneaded and conjoined together.* Certainly, this body of Chriſt compoſed of many grains and kneaded with water, cannot be the body of Chriſt crucified for us.

Juſtin in his ſecond Apology, ſaith: * *The Deacons do give to every one of thoſe that are preſent to participate, bread and wine, and water, whereupon thanksgivings have been ſaid.* Then he addeth, *that this bread is the body of Chriſt.* But he ſheweth manifeſtly that this body of Chriſt, is not that which was crucified for us, in that he ſaith, † *it is a meat wherewith our fleſh and blood are fed by the tranſmutation.* He ſpeaketh of the change made by the digeſtion. For our bodies are not fed of, or with the body crucified for us, that body is not changed into our fleſh and blood. For, that *Juſtin* believed not the Tranſubſtantiation, he ſheweth it ſufficiently in the Dialogue againſt *Try-*

---

§ Dominus corpus ſuum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congeſtum.

‖ Nec corpus Domini poteſt eſſe farina ſola, aut aqua ſola, niſi utrumque adunatum fuerit, &c.

* Οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι δίδοασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.

† Τροφὴν ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σαρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν.

phonius, ſaying. § *The oblation of fine flower was a figure of the bread of the Euchariſt, which our Lord Jeſus hath ordained to be made in remembrance of his Paſſion.*

Ireneus in his firſt book ſaith the ſame. ‡ *The Lord hath affirmed that the cup, which is a creature wherewith he maketh our bodies grow, is his body.* Would *Ireneus* have loſt his wit ſo far, as to believe that our bodies grow and are fed with the crucified body of the Lord, and with the blood ſhed upon the Croſs, which did not return into his body?

The ſame diſtinction of two ſorts of body of Chriſt, in the writings of the antient fathers, appeareth in that they do ſpeak of the pieces of the body of Chriſt, and of the reſidues of the body of Chriſt that remain after the Communion: Which cannot agree with Chriſt's natural body crucified for us, that cannot be broken in pieces, and whereof there can be no reſidue. Pope *Gelaſius* in the canon *Comperimus*, ſecond diſtinction of the Conſecration. ||| *We have learned that ſome having taken one part of the body of Chriſt, abſtain from the cup*, which thing he calleth a ſacrilege. And *Evagrius* the Hiſtorian in his fourth book, chapter 36. *|| *The antient cuſtom of the royal city requireth, that when many pieces of the immaculate body of Chriſt remain, children not yet in age to be corrupted, going to ſchool, be called for to eat them.* How could one give pieces of the natural body of

---

§ Η τῆς σεμιδάλεως, &c. Τύπος ἦν τῦ ἄρτυ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν τὶς αν ἀμνησιν τῦ παθυς, &c.

‡ Eum calicem, qui eſt creatura, ſuum corpus confirmavit ex quo noſtra auget corpora.

||| Comperimus quod quidam ſumpta tantummodo corporis ſacri portione à calice ſacrati cruoris abſtineant.

*|| Εθος παλαιὸν βέλεται ἀνᾶ τὴν βασιλέυσαι, ὅτ' ἂν πολύ τι χρῆμα των ἁγίων τῦ ἀχραάλε σώματος Χριςῦ τῦ θεῦ ἡμων ἐν ἀπομεινοι, παῖδας ἀφθόρους μεταπεμφθῆναι πρὶ τῶν ἐς χαμαι διδασκάλους φοιτώντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατεσθιειν.

Chriſt,

Chriſt, who ſitteth at the right hand of God? What likelihood is there to give to a troop of little children the reſidues of the body of Chriſt? Would not that be eſteemed at this day in the *Roman* Church, an horrible profanation?

Wherefore it is a thing very frequent in the fathers to ſay, that *Panis eſt Corpus Chriſti*, The bread *is Chriſt's body*. And we have heard St. *Auſtin* here above ſpeak ſo. Words, which if they were taken or underſtood of the natural body of Chriſt, would be falſe. For the bread is not the body that was crucified for us.

It is therefore unjuſtly done by our adverſaries to expoſe unto the view, with great noiſe and rumour, ſome places out of the books of Sacraments attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, and out of the book of the Lord's Supper attributed to *Cyprian*, wherein is ſaid that the bread after the words of Conſecration, becometh and is made Chriſt's body: Since we do ſhew by ſo many proofs, that they ſpeak of another body than of that which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and that was crucified, as we will ſhew yet more clearly hereafter.

For, that the author of theſe books attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, hath believed that after the Conſecration the bread is bread ſtill: He ſhews it plainly when he ſaith, * 'Let us therefore eſtabliſh this, to wit, how that 'which is bread, may be Chriſt's body'. And a little after. † 'If there be ſuch power and virtue in the 'word of the Lord Jeſus, as to make that things which 'were not, begin to be: How much more ſhall he 'make that the things which were, be, and be chang-'ed into other things?' This excellent place, which ſaith that the things which were, are ſtill, that is to ſay, that that which was bread, is bread ſtill, is found

* Lib. 4. de Sacrament. cap. 4.

† Si tanta vis in Sermone Domini Jeſu, ut inciperent eſſe quæ non erant, quanto magis operatorius eſt ut ſint quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur.

thus alledged by *Lombard* in his 4th book of *Sentences*, diſtinction 10. And by *Thomas* in the third part of his ſum, queſtion 78. Art. 4. And by *Gratian* in the ſecond diſtinction of the conſecration, at the Canon *Panis eſt*; and by ‖*Gabriel Biel*, and *Alger*, and *Ivo Carnutenſis*, and *Jodocus Coccius*; and not according to the new editions of *Ambroſe*, in which theſe words, *Sint quæ erant*, are left out. Such falſifications are frequent in the new editions.

Some Places may be found indeed, wherein ſome Fathers ſay, that the Bread of the Euchariſt is the Body of the Lord crucified for us. But that muſt be underſtood after the ſame Manner as Chriſt ſaid of the Bread that it was his Body, and that the Cup is the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the Sacrament or Remembrance of it.

They do object a Place of Saint *Hilary*, out of his 'eighth Book of the Trinity, where he ſaith, '‡Of the 'Truth of the Fleſh and Blood, there is no Doubt: 'For at this Day both by the Profeſſion of the Lord, 'and by our Faith it is Fleſh indeed, and Blood in-'deed: And theſe Things taken and ſwallowed down, 'cauſe us to be in Chriſt and Chriſt in us.'

Firſt of all it is a great abuſe to urge St. *Hilary*, who in this point of the nature of Chriſt's body had an error that deſtroys the whole chriſtian religion: For § he teacheth, that Chriſt in his paſſion ſuffered no manner of pain at all, and that the ſtripes they

---

‖ Gabr. lect. 40. in Can. Miſſæ Alger. de Sacram corp. lib. 2. cap. 7. Ivo Car. 2. Parte. cap. 7. Et Iodocus Coccius Tom. 2. lib. 6. p. 62.

‡ De veritate carnis & ſanguinis non relictus eſt ambigendi locus. Nunc enim & ipſius Domini profeſſione, & fide noſtra vere caro eſt & vere ſanguis. Et hæc accepta atque hauſta efficiunt ut & nos in Chriſto & Chriſtus in nobis ſit.

§ Hilar. lib. 10. de Trinitate. In quem quamvis aut ictus incideret, aut vulnus deſcenderet, &c. afferrent quidem hæc impetum paſſionis, non tamen dolorem paſſionis inferrent, ut telum aliquod aut aquam perforans, aut ignem compungens, aut aëra vulnerans. Et paulo poſt, Virtus corporis, ſine ſenſu pœnæ vim pœnæ in ſe deſævientis excepit.

gave

gave him, were as if they had pierced the air, or the fire with a dart. Secondly, it appeareth that *Hilary* ſpeaketh of the ſpiritual manducation. For by it alone are we in Chriſt, and Chriſt in us. Thirdly, when *Hilary* ſaith, there remaineth no place to doubt of the truth of the fleſh and blood of the Lord, he doth not mean it muſt not be doubted, but that in the Euchariſt we eat truly the natural fleſh of Chriſt by the mouth of the body: But he ſaith, that we muſt not doubt but Chriſt had a true fleſh and a true blood: For he diſputeth againſt certain Hereticks that deſtroyed the truth of his human nature.

For as touching the *Myſtagogical Catecheſes* attributed to *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, which are objected againſt us, where it is ſaid, that we muſt not believe our ſenſes, telling us that it is bread: It is certain that thoſe *Catecheſes* are ſuppoſed, and falſly attributed to *Cyril*; for the ſtile of them is very different from thoſe eighteen *Catecheſes* of *Cyril* that precede them, which are cited by *Theodoret*, and by *Galaſius*, and by *Damaſcen*; but theſe laſt are never alledged by any one. * In the firſt *Catecheſe*, there is an evident mark of falſity, for he diſſuadeth his hearers from frequenting the amphitheatre, where the gladiators chaſes and combats were made againſt wild beaſts, and the *Hippodromus* or *Circus*, that is to ſay, the park or place where horſe races and combats were exerciſed. For then were no ſuch buildings nor ſpectacles in *Jeruſalem*, nor never were any ſince *Jeruſalem* was chriſtian.

And concerning *Chryſoſtom*'s hyperbolical amplifications, ſaying, that the altar ſtreams with blood, that we faſten our teeth in his fleſh, that we put our fingers in his wounds and ſuck the blood of them, and that a ſeraphim bringeth unto us a burning coal with a pair of tongs, they be outlaſhing words that ſavour of a

---

* Πόμπη διαβόλου θεατρομανίαι ἢ ἱπποδρομίαι καυηγισία, &c.

declamation, and which our adverſaries themſelves do not believe.

CHAP. XXIX. *That divers antient Fathers have believed a myſtical Union of the Godhead of Chriſt with the bread of the Sacrament.*

NEvertheleſs, I cannot deny but that many fathers have had an opinion, which with good reaſon is rejected by the Roman Church of theſe days. They teach, that as Chriſt's divine nature hath united itſelf perſonally unto this human nature, ſo the ſame divine nature by vertue of the conſecration, is united to the bread of the euchariſt, by an union though not perſonal and hypoſtatical, yet myſtical, divine, and ineffable, by which the bread remaining bread, is made the body of Chriſt. For they uſe this compariſon, taken from the perſonal union of the two natures of Chriſt, for to ſhew how the bread is the body of Chriſt: This opinion hath no foundation in the Scripture. Yet I dare ſay, it is an error no way prejudicial to chriſtian religion. For that opinion changeth not the nature of Chriſt, and deſtroys not his humanity. Neither doth it deſtroy the nature of the Sacrament, ſince they did believe that the bread changeth not its ſubſtance. Whence alſo they worſhipped not the Sacrament, neither did they fall into Idolatry. To be ſhort, it was an innocent error, ſerving to augment and encreaſe the people's reſpect and reverence to the holy ſacrament, which for that cauſe they call terrible and wonderful.

In the mean while we have in that a moſt evident proof that theſe fathers did not believe the tranſubſtantiation. For as they believed not that by the union of Chriſt's divinity with his humanity, the human nature was tranſubſtantiated, or his body aboliſhed: So did not they believe, that by this myſtical and divine union of the God-head of Chriſt with the bread, the bread ſhould be deſtroyed, and turned into another ſubſtance.

By

By this doctrine, the bread of the euchariſt is the body of Chriſt in two manners; the one becauſe of that myſtical union of the bread with Chriſt, after the ſame ſort as Jeſus Chriſt man is called the Son of God, becauſe of the perſonal union with the Son of God; the other, becauſe this bread is the ſacred ſign and remembrance of Chriſt's body, as it is uſual to give to the ſigns the name of that which they do ſignify. For this ſecond conſideration they ſay that the bread of the euchariſt is the body which was born of the Virgin, and crucified for us. For as touching the firſt conſideration, it is certain, that this bread which they ſay is made Chriſt's body, by that myſtical union, is another body of Chriſt, than that which was crucified for us. For to effect ſuch a tranſmutation, they interpoſe the omnipotence of God. For it muſt be a divine power, for to cauſe that the bread remaining bread, be ſo ſtraitly united to the Godhead of Chriſt, as to become the body of Chriſt.

Now, that theſe Fathers do hold that this myſtical body of Chriſt is another body than that which was crucified for us, though it be the ſame in ſignification, we proved it juſt now by a multitude of places of fathers, wherein they ſay that Chriſt hath two ſorts of fleſh, and that we may very well eat of that fleſh or myſtical body which is taken in the Sacrament, but no manner of way eat the fleſh that was crucified for us.

The firſt Father that ever made uſe of the perſonal union of the two natures of Chriſt, for to ſhew how the bread is made the body of Chriſt, not by tranſubſtantiation, but by the myſterious union of the Godhead of Chriſt with the bread, is *Juſtin Martyr*, about the end of his ſecond apology, where he ſpeaketh thus; 'we do not take theſe things as common bread, 'but after the ſame manner as Chriſt our Saviour was 'incarnate, and made fleſh and blood for our ſal-'vation, ſo we have been taught, that the meat 'whereon thankſgivings have been rendred by the

' prayer of the word, whereby our fleſh is nouriſhed by * ' tranſmutation, is the body and blood of Chriſt Jeſus.' Now that *Juſtin* believed, that this meat is bread ſtill, and hath not loſt its ſubſtance, he ſheweth it when he ſaith that our bodies are fed with it. And by that which he ſaith in that very place, ' that the Deacons ' give to all them that are preſent to participate, ' the bread and wine, whereupon graces have been ' ſaid.'

The Author likewiſe of the catecheſtical prayer attributed to *Gregory* of *Nyſſe*, uſeth the ſame compariſon †. ' The body *ſaith he*, was changed into a di- ' vine dignity, by the inhabitation of the word God. ' With good reaſon then alſo now I believe, that the ' bread, ſanctified by the word of God, is changed ' into the body of God the word.' If this compariſon be good, as the body of Chriſt was not tranſubſtantiated by the inhabitation of the Godhead: No more likewiſe is the bread tranſubſtantiated by the conſecration which is made at the ſacrament.

Hilary ſpeaketh juſt ſo, in the eighth book of the Trinity ‡; ' if the word was truly made fleſh, and ' we alſo in the meat of the Lord, do take the word ' fleſh.'

Gratian, in his ſecond diſtinction of the conſecration §, alledgeth a place of *Auſtin*, drawn from the ſentences of *Proſper*, in theſe words, ' The Sacrifice ' of the church is compoſed of two things, to wit of ' the ſacrament, and of the thing of the ſacrament;

---

* By this tranſmutation he underſtandeth the change of the bread, which is made in the ſtomach, for the nouriſhment of our bodies.

† I ſhew this falſity in my book againſt Cardinal *du Perron*. lib. 7. cap. 22. namely, in that he ſpeaks of one *Severus*, an Heretick, which came above one hundred years after the death of this *Gregory*.

‡ Si vere verbum caro factum eſt, & nos verbum carnem cibo Dominico ſumimus.

§ Can. hoc eſt. Hoc eſt quod dicimus, &c. ſicut Chriſti perſona conſtat ex Deo & homine, cum ipſe Chriſtus verus ſit Deus & verus ſit homo.

' that

' that is to ſay of the body of Chriſt, after the ſame ' manner as Chriſt's perſon is compoſed of God and ' Man. For Chriſt is very God and very man.'

Ireneus hath an opinion by himſelf. For he ſaith ‖, that the bread is the body of Chriſt, becauſe Chriſt is the creator of all things, eſteeming that the whole world in reſpect of God, is what the body of man is to his ſoul; which was the opinion and belief of *Plato*, of *Cicero*, of *Virgil*, and of all the *Platonick* ſchool, that bore the ſway in *Ireneus*'s time.

Such was the belief of the author of the book of the Lord's ſupper, attributed to St. *Cyprian*; that author ſpeaketh thus *, ' The common bread being ' changed into fleſh, and into blood bringeth life and ' growth unto the body. And therefore the infirmi- ' ty of our fleſh being helped by the accuſtomed effect, ' is taught by a ſenſible proof, that in the viſible ' ſacraments there is an effect of eternal life.' When he ſaith, that the common bread is turned into fleſh, and into blood, he doth not mean that it is turned into the fleſh and blood of Chriſt, but into our fleſh and blood by digeſtion; for he addeth, that this bread nouriſheth our bodies and maketh them to grow; and all the current of the ſpeech ſheweth that. But a little after he addeth ſome words, whereupon our adverſaries do triumph and glory, for lack of underſtanding what this author's belief was. ' § The bread,

---

‖ Quomodo conſtabit eis eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ ſunt, corpus eſſe Domini ſui & calicem ſanguinem ejus, ſi non ipſum fabricatoris mundi filium dicunt. i. verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, defluunt fontes, & dat terra primo quidem fœnum deinde ſpicas.

* Panis iſte communis in carnem et ſanguinem mutatus, procurat vitam & incrementum corporibus, ideoque ex conſueto rerum effectu fidei noſtræ adjuta infirmitas ſenſibili argumento, edocta eſt viſibilibus Sacramentis ineſſe vitæ æternæ effectum.

§ Panis quem Dominus diſcipulis porrigebat, non effigie, ſed natura mutatus omnipotentia verbi factus eſt caro. Et ſicut in perſona Chriſti humanitas videbatur, & latebat divinitas, ita Sacramento viſibili ineffabiliter divina ſe infudit eſſentia.

* *ſaith*

'*ſaith he*, that the Lord gave to his diſciples, being 'changed, not in ſhew but in nature, is made fleſh by 'the omnipotency of the word.' But in the words following, he ſheweth, that this converſion of the bread into the fleſh of Chriſt, is made, not by tranſubſtantiation, but by an union of the Godhead of Chriſt with the bread, like unto the union of Chriſt's divine nature with his human nature: for he added immediately after, 'And even as in the perſon of Chriſt 'his humanity was ſeen, but his divinity was hidden, ſo 'the divine eſſence is infuſed in the viſible Sacrament 'by an unſpeakable manner.' There is nothing more expreſs nor more contrary unto Tranſubſtantiation. For according to this author's belief, even as Chriſt's divine nature did not tranſubſtantiate his manhood, but made it to be the fleſh of the Son of God: So the divine eſſence, which he ſaith to be infuſed in the bread of the Sacrament, maketh it to become Chriſt's body, without being tranſubſtantiated. Wherefore a little after, he ſaith, that that which we receive in the Sacrament, § *is unleavened bread, which ſanctifieth us by touching it*, acknowledging that it is bread ſtill.

Bellarmin in the 15th chapter of his third book of the Euchariſt, alledgeth St. *Remigius*, that wrote about the year of our Lord 520, in theſe words, '‡ The 'fleſh which the word of God the Father took into 'the Virgin's womb, in unity of perſon, and the 'bread that is conſecrated in the church, are one 'and the ſelf-ſame body. For the plenitude of the 'divinity which was in that fleſh, filleth alſo this 'bread.' *Bellarmin* addeth, that *Haimo* held the ſame language, and that *Gelaſius* and *Theodoret*'s words, that

§ Panis itaque hic azymus, cibus verus & ſincerus per ſpeciem & Sacramentum nos tactu ſanctificat.

‡ Caro quam Verbum Dei Patris aſſumpſit in utero virginali in unitate ſuæ perſonæ, et panis qui conſecratur in eccleſia, unum corpus ſunt. Divinitatis enim plenitudo quæ fuit in illa, replet et iſtum panem.

we

we have alledged above, may be fitted to this opinion.

The author our adverſaries alledge with more oſtentation, is *Damaſcene*, whom they rank among the Saints. This man may be termed the *Lombard* of the *Grecians*, becauſe he is the firſt among the *Grecians* that handled divinity in philoſophical terms: And is the firſt that wrote for the adoration of images. Now, he did write about the year of our Lord 740. This man in his 4th book of the orthodox faith, chap. 14. extendeth himſelf upon this matter and will have the bread ‖ *to be changed into the body of the Lord*, not by tranſubſtantiation, but by * *Aſſumption* and union with the divinity, like unto the union of Chriſt's divinity, with his humanity; ' Becauſe, *ſaith he*, † that it is the cuſtom to eat bread, and to drink ' wine and water, the Lord hath conjoined his divi- ' nity to theſe things, and hath made them to be his ' body and blood.' And a little after, ' ‡ If thou ' inquireſt in what manner that is done, let it ſuffice ' thee to underſtand, that it is done by the holy Spirit, ' after the ſame manner as the Lord hath made himſelf ' to himſelf and in himſelf, a fleſh taken of the holy ' Mother of God by the Holy Ghoſt.' And a little ' after, he ſaith, ' that the bread and wine *‡ is the ' body of Chriſt deified.' Chiefly he is very expreſs, '

‖ Μεταποιεῖσθαι.

* Παραλαμβάνεται.

† Επειδὴ ἔθος τοῖς ανθρώποις ἄρτον εσθίειν, ὕδωρ τε καὶ οἶνον πινειν συνέζευξεν αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτῦ θεότητα, καὶ πεποίηκεν αυτά σῶμα καὶ αἷμα αυτῦ.

‡ Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκῦσαι οτι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίυ, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκυ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίυ ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ κύριος σάρκα κατεσκήσατο.

*‡ Τὸ σῶμα τῦ κυρίυ τεθεωμένον.

in

in that he addeth, ‘ † the bread of the Communion ‘ is not mere bread, but it is conjoined to the divi- ‘ nity.’ But ſtill he acknowledgeth that it is bread, ſaying, ‘ the bread is the body of Chriſt,’ and calling it *the bread of the Communion*; and a little after, ‘ the loaves of propoſition did figurate this bread :’ *Item*, ‘ The bread is the firſt fruits of the future ‘ bread.’ And a little after, ‘ we partake all of one ‘ bread.’ Only he hath this of particular to himſelf, that he will not have the bread to be called the figure of Chriſt's body, rejecting that kind of ſpeech, uſual and ordinary in the fathers that have written before him.

It appeareth likewiſe in that he will have the Sacrament to be honoured, but not to be worſhipped. ‘ ‡ Let us, *ſaith he*, honour it with purity corporal ‘ and ſpiritual ;’ and will have it to be received with the hands ſet in form of a croſs. For then it was not as yet the cuſtom to chop it into the mouths of communicants.

Rupertus was imbrued with the ſame opinion, ‘ ‖ Even as Chriſt, *ſaith he*, did neither change nor ‘ deſtroy the human nature, but joined himſelf unto ‘ it : So in the Sacrament he neither deſtroyeth nor ‘ changeth the ſubſtance of the bread and wine, but ‘ joineth himſelf unto it in the unity of his body and ‘ blood.’ For which cauſe alſo, *Bellarmin* placeth him among the *Impanators*.

This doctrine doth no whit agree with the ubiquity. For they did put this union of Chriſt with the bread, in the Sacrament only, which bringeth no man-

---

† Ἄρτος τῆς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἄρτος λιτός ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἡνωμένος θεότητι.

‡ Τιμήσωμεν δὲ αὐτὸ πάσῃ καθαρότητι ψυχικῇ τε καὶ σωματικῇ.

‖ Rupertus Tuitienſis in Exod. c. 12. Sicut Chriſtus humanam naturam nec mutavit, nec deſtruxit, ſed aſſumpſit, ita in Sacramento, nec deſtruit, nec mutat ſubſtantiam panis et vini, ſed aſſumit in unitatem corporis & ſanguinis ſui.

nor

ner of change to the natural body of Chriſt. But theſe Fathers make two bodies of Chriſt: The one his natural body, which is but in Heaven, the other the bread of the Sacrament, which they make to be Chriſt's body two manner of ways: To wit, becauſe it is united to the divinity of Chriſt by an union like unto the hypoſtatical union of the two natures of Chriſt, and becauſe it is a ſign, figure, and ſymbol of Chriſt's natural body: According as the ſigns are wont to be called by the name of that which they do ſignify and repreſent. Whence alſo they ſay ſometimes that that bread is the body of Chriſt, born of the Virgin, and crucified for us.

Whoſoever ſhall apprehend this aright, ſhall have a key in their hand for to enter into the knowledge and intelligence of the Fathers, and for to come out of all difficulties. It is the ſolution of the places of *Cyril* that are objected againſt us, and of thoſe of *Ambroſe* out of the books of Sacraments. For indeed the author of the books of Sacraments was one of theſe *Impanators*, ſince that he holdeth that by the unſpeakable virtue of God, the bread becometh the body of Chriſt and yet remains bread ſtill, as we have proved, and alledged the form of the ſervice of that time, where it was ſaid, * 'That the oblation we offer, is the 'figure of the body of Chriſt:' And in the 4 chap. 'Let us eſtabliſh this, to wit, how THAT WHICH 'IS BREAD, may be the body of Chriſt.' And a little after, he ſaith that the bread and the wine are ſtill what they were, and yet are changed into the body and blood of the Lord. We muſt not wonder if for to work this change in the bread of the Sacrament, he employeth the omnipotency of God, and his unexpreſſible virtue in changing things. For indeed if that union he conceiveth, were true, it were an

* Ambroſ. l. 4. de Sacram. c. 5. Fac nobis hanc oblationem aſcriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis Chriſti.

unſpeakable

unſpeakable and incomprehenſible work, and wherein human reaſon is ſtark blind.

Becauſe of this myſtical union which is near unto the perſonal union, *Cyril* of *Alexandria* ſaith, that this body of Chriſt received into our bodies, maketh them ſuſceptible and capable of the Reſurrection. Which truly is an abuſe. For by the ſame reaſon the participation of the Sacrament ſhould keep us from dying. The Faithful of the Old Teſtament, and *John* the Baptiſt, and the *Thief* crucified with Chriſt, and an infinite number of Martyrs, that were never partakers of this Sacrament, are no leſs capable of the reſurrection.

From the impanation ſprung up that cuſtom by which in old time many particular perſons carried away the Euchariſt into their own houſes, and kept it locked up in a cheſt or cupboard, as † *Gorgonia* did, who was ſiſter to *Gregory Nazianzen*. Which ſheweth on the one ſide that they did give unto that bread ſomething more than to be the figure and ſign of Chriſt's body. And on the other ſide that ſheweth alſo that they did not believe the Tranſubſtantiation. For they would never have put Chriſt's natural body into a woman's hand, for to keep it lock'd up in a cupboard.

From the ſame opinion proceeded that which *Satyrus* ‡ did, who was St. *Ambroſe*'s brother, and yet unbaptized. Who being upon the ſea in danger of ſhipwreck, cauſed the Euchariſt to be given him, and hanged it about his neck, and then threw himſelf into the ſea, for to ſave himſelf by ſwimming. An evident proof they believed that in this Sacrament there was ſome ſecret vertue, and that nevertheleſs they believed not this bread to be the natural body of Chriſt, crucified for us. For they would never have given it to an unbaptized perſon for to hang it about his neck, and caſt it with him into the Sea.

---

† Gregor. Nazianz. Oratione de ſorore Gorgonia.
‡ Ambroſ. Oratione de obitu fratris Satyri.

Neither

Neither is it to be omitted that the Fathers never ſpeak of the *ſpecies* of the bread in the plural, but only in the ſingular, becauſe that by the *ſpecies of the bread*, they underſtand the ſubſtance of the bread, which is one. But our Adverſaries, which deprave the Fathers terms as well as their doctrine, ſpeak of the *ſpecies* of the bread in the plural, becauſe that by the *ſpecies* of the bread, they underſtand accidents without a ſubject, which are many. Which is a new doctrine, and a phraſe or kind of ſpeech altogether unuſual, not only in philoſophers, but alſo in the Fathers, and in all antiquity.

CHAP. XXX. *Particular opinion of* St. Auſtin *and of* Fulgentius, *and of* Innocent *the third.*

AUSTIN, and *Fulgentius* his diſciple, take ſometimes theſe words, *This is my body*, in a ſenſe particular to themſelves. For beſides this expoſition, which is very frequent in St. *Auſtin*, namely, that the Lord called the bread his body, becauſe it is the figure and ſign of his body: In ſome places he will have in theſe words *THIS is my body*, that by this word, *Body*, the Church be underſtood. For in his Sermon to Children, which is to be found at the end of *Fulgentius*'s works, he ſpeaketh thus: 'Theſe 'things are called ſacraments, becauſe in them one 'thing is ſeen, and another underſtood, &c. If then 'thou wilt know what the body of Chriſt is, hear the 'Apoſtle ſaying, Ye are the body and members of 'Chriſt.' And in the 26 Treatiſe upon St. *John*. 'By this meat, and by this drink, the Lord will have 'the fellowſhip of his body and of his members to be 'underſtood, to wit, the holy church of the Predeſti-'nate.'

Pope *Innocent* the third holdeth the ſame doctrine: For in his 4th book of the myſteries of the Maſs, he ſaith, that Chriſt hath two bodies, to wit, his natural body, which he took of the Virgin, and which was crucified, and his myſtical body, *viz.* the Church. Then he

he addeth: § 'The myſtical body is eaten ſpiritually, 'that is to ſay in faith under the ſpecies of the bread.'

By all the premiſes it is plain and evident, that he who forſaking the ſcriptures, taketh the Fathers for his addreſs or direction, intangleth himſelf into marvellous difficulties, and caſteth himſelf into darkneſs, and in a labyrinth without iſſue. And that a man muſt be well read in them, and obſerve and heed them very exactly, for to attain to an indifferent knowledge of them. That if any one readeth them carefully, and with an unpre-occupated mind, though he meets with many errors in them, and ſmall agreement among themſelves: Yet he ſhall find them ſo far from the doctrine of the Roman Church, as the Heavens are from the Earth.

CHAP. XXXI. *That the Church of* Rome *condemning the Impanation, is fallen herſelf into an error a thouſand times more pernicious, by Tranſubſtantiation. And of the adoration of the accidents of the bread.*

WE have ſhewed that many fathers have believed that the divinity of the Lord is joined to the bread of the Euchariſt, by an union coming near unto the perſonal union that is between the two natures of Chriſt. The Tranſubſtantiation, is an imitation of this doctrine, but in the worſe: For whereas theſe Fathers conjoin the Godhead of Chriſt with the ſubſtance of the bread. The Church of *Rome* conjoineth Chriſt with the accidents of bread, with a more ſtrait union than that which thoſe *Impanators* did put between the divinity of the Lord, and the bread of the Euchariſt.

For the antient fathers eſteemed not that becauſe of the union of Chriſt with the ſubſtance of the bread, the bread ſhould be worſhipped. But the *Roman* Church by reaſon of the union of Chriſt's body with the accidents of the bread, worſhippeth theſe accidents,

§ Myſticum corpus comeditur ſpiritualiter, id eſt, in fide ſub ſpecie panis.

that

that is to ſay, the roundneſs, whiteneſs, ſavour, and breadth of the Hoſt, with the ſame adoration that Chriſt's body is worſhipped with. The Council of *Trent* in the XIII. Seſſion, ordaineth upon pain of a curſe, that the Sacrament ſhall be worſhipped with divine adoration, called *Latria*. Now by the Sacrament, the council underſtandeth the body of Chriſt with the *ſpecies* or accidents. Of which abuſe hath been ſpoken before.

It is therefore very wrongfully that the Church of *Rome* condemns thoſe that have put a myſtical and unſpeakable union between the Godhead of Chriſt and the bread of the Sacrament, ſince our adverſaries themſelves bring in another, a thouſand times more abſurd and more pernicious, between Chriſt and the accidents of bread. More abſurd, I ſay: For the union of two ſubſtances may eaſily be conceived: But to unite a ſubſtance with the accidents of another ſubſtance, as if one ſhould put the Moon under the accidents of a Horſe, is a thing and a conceit which paſſeth all the imaginations of hypocondriacs, and which cannot fall into the mind of any man that hath not interdicted to himſelf the uſe of reaſon. Add moreover that this doctrine deſtroyeth the nature of the Sacrament, and the humanity of Chriſt, as we have proved; and bindeth men to worſhip a piece of bread with divine adoration. Things, which the antient Church never believed nor practiſed.

It ſeemeth that Satan, when he tempted Chriſt in the wilderneſs, was a projecting this doctrine, and making an eſſay or trial of it. For promiſing unto Chriſt imaginary kingdoms, he propoſed unto him accidents without a ſubject. And in ſpeaking to him of turning ſtones into bread, he ſpoke to him of a Tranſubſtantiation.

---

* Bellar. 13. cap. 5. Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur quin omnes Chriſti fideles latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic Sanctiſſimo Sacramento in veneratione adhibeant.

CHAP. XXXII. *That the Sacrifice of the Maſs was not inſtituted by Chriſt. Confeſſion of our Adverſaries.*

IN the holy Scripture, the holy Supper is not called a ſacrifice. Chriſt in inſtituting this Sacrament, offered nor preſented nothing to his father, but only to his diſciples, ſaying, *Take, Eat.* He made no elevation of the Hoſt; the Apoſtles worſhipped not the Sacraments. In a word, there did not paſs in it, any of the actions neceſſarily required in a ſacrifice properly ſo called. *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth it freely, ſaying, 'The oblation which is after the conſecration, belongeth to the integrity of the ſacrifice, but is not of its eſſence; which is proved in that the Lord made not this oblation, nor the Apoſtles themſelves at the beginning, as we have demonſtrated it out of Gregory.' A confeſſion very notable, by which this Cardinal will have Chriſt and his Apoſtles to have made a ſacrifice without offering any thing; that is to ſay, that in the Euchariſt he offered not himſelf in ſacrifice. But now the Church of *Rome* offereth Chriſt Jeſus in ſacrifice, againſt Chriſt's example, and the example of his Apoſtles.

Salmeron Jeſuit, in the XIII Tom. and firſt book of commentaries upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, † maketh an enumeration of the unwritten traditions, and puts in their rank the eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, that is to ſay the papal monarchy, and the ſervice of images, and the Maſs, and the manner of ſacrificing. And the tradition, that Chriſt made a ſacrifice in bread and wine.' And here are the reaſons

---

* Bellar. l. 1. de Miſſa c. 27. § 5. Oblatio quæ ſequitur conſecrationem, ad integritatem ſacrificii pertinet, non ad eſſentiam. Quod non ad eſſentiam, probatur, tam ex eo quod Dominus eam oblationem non adhibuit, immo nec Apoſtoli in principio, ut ex Gregorio demonſtratum eſt.

† Parte 2. Diſp. 8. § 5. Opus. Et §. Poſtremo. & § Porro.

why

why he thinketh it was not expedient thoſe things ſhould be written, or taught by word of mouth, ‘‡ it ‘ is, *ſaith he*, a fooliſh thing to think the Apoſtles have ‘ written all, or given all by tradition, that would ‘ turn to injury againſt the Holy Ghoſt, acting and ‘ revealing; and it would be a thing uncouth unto ‘ nature, which comprehends not all things at once.’ And there he giveth a particular reaſon wherefore theſe † things were not to be written, to wit, ‘ that ‘ Chriſt's commandment might be kept, *give not that* ‘ *which is holy unto dogs*.’ If we believe this doctor, the doctrine of the birth and paſſion of our Saviour was given unto dogs; for it was God's will it ſhould be ſet down in writing. By theſe dogs he meaneth the people and the princes.

Cardinal ‖ *Baronius* maketh the ſame confeſſion, and acknowledgeth ingenuouſly that the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt is an unwritten tradition, and whereof, by conſequent, no mention is made in the Goſpel.

And *Gregory* of *Valentia* a Jeſuit, in the 4 chap. of his firſt book of the Maſs; ‘ * Even though this ‘ ſervice or worſhip [of the Maſs] had not been in- ‘ ſtituted by God, yet theſe men could not conclude ‘ that it is not lawful, for we have ſhewed that that ‘ [to wit to be commanded of God] is not neceſſa- ‘ rily required, for to make that a ſervice be good.’

All theſe doctors ſpeaking thus, condemn tacitly the council of *Trent*, who in XXII. ſeſſion, chap. 1. declareth and defineth, that by theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, the Lord eſtabliſhed the Prieſt-

‡ Part 3. Diſp. 8. §. Quinto Tradit. Stultum eſt omnia ab Apoſtolis ſcripta putare, vel omnia ab eis tradita fuiſſe. Et in injuriam vergeret agentis & revelantis Spiritus. Et inſuave eſſet naturæ noſtræ quæ omnia ſimul non capit.

† § Quinto opus. Hæc literis conſignari minime debuerant, ut ſervaretur præceptum Chriſti, Nolite dare ſanctum canibus.

‖ Baron Annal. ad annum 53. §. 13.

* Si maxime ille cultus à Deo inſtitutus non eſſet, concludi tamen ab iſtis non poſſet non eſſe legitimum, cum id ad bonitatem cultus minime requiratur.

hood

hood of the New Teſtament. Words which *Matthew* and *Mark* would not have omitted, if by them the Lord had inſtituted the ſacrifice of the Prieſthood of the New Teſtament.

CHAP. XXXIII. *That the Sacrifice of the Maſs agrees neither with Scripture nor with reaſon.*

1. THE two third parts of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, are employed in ſpeaking both of the ſacrifice and of the prieſthood of the Chriſtian Church, where nevertheleſs no mention is made at all of the Euchariſt, nor of any other Sacrifice of redemption than the death of Chriſt our Lord.

2. Moreover, in many places, namely, about the end of the ninth chapter, the Apoſtle ſaith, *as it is appointed unto Men once to die, ſo Chriſt was once offered for to take away our ſins.* Teaching us, that as man dieth but once, and that the death of men is not reiterated, neither bloodily nor unbloodily: ſo the Sacrifice by which Chriſt offered himſelf for our ſins, receiveth no iteration. And in the tenth chapter two ſeveral times, he ſaith in expreſs terms that Chriſt hath offered *Unicam oblationem*, one only ſacrifice and then ſat him down on the right hand of God.

3. For ſince Chriſt's death is a price and a ſufficient ſacrifice for our redemption; there is no more need of another ſacrifice of redemption. That if for applying unto ourſelves Chriſt's ſacrifice he muſt be ſacrificed again, by the ſame reaſon for to apply his death unto ourſelves, he muſt be put to death again. Chriſt and his death is applyed unto us by the fraction of the Bread, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. And by Baptiſm *Galat.* 3. 27. And by that faith whereby Saint *Paul*, ſaith, that he dwelleth in our hearts, *Eph.* 3. 17. but not in ſacrificing him.

4. But how ſhould Chriſt in the Maſs ſatisfy for our ſins, ſeeing he is no more in that condition of ſatisfying, nor of ſuffering for us? But only in the ſtate of interceding and impetrating for us, as *Bellarmin*

min confeſſeth, '* Chriſt ſaith he, cannot now merit 'nor ſatisfy, but only impetrate. Wherefore the 'proper virtue and efficacy of this ſacrifice is 'to impetrate; not therefore to redeem and ſatisfy.' Now for to impetrate Chriſt's interceſſion whereby he maketh requeſt for us, ſitting at the right hand of his Father, *Rom.* 8. 33. is ſufficient, without being needful to ſacrifice him.

5. Wherefore the Paſtors of the Chriſtian Church, are never called Prieſts in the Scripture, for to diſtinguiſh them from the people. But all the faithful are called Prieſts by St. *Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle, Chap. 2. 9. And by St. *John*, *Revelation* 1. 6. *He hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father.*

6. The Apoſtle St. *Paul* to the *Epheſians* 4. 11, maketh a denumeration of the offices which Chriſt, aſcending up to Heaven, left here to his Church; *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts: And ſome Paſtors and Teachers.* Of Prieſts and Sacrificers he ſpeaketh not one word. No more than in the firſt to *Timothy*, and in the Epiſtle to *Titus*, where he deſcribeth the duty of Prieſts (whom he calleth alſo Biſhops) and of Deacons, without making any mention of this Prieſthood.

7. It is evident that to be a Sacrificer, is a thing more excellent than to be Sacrificed. So *Aaron* was more excellent than the beaſts that he offered. Not only becauſe he was a man, and had theſe Sacrifices in his power: But alſo becauſe theſe Lambs and Bullocks were figures of Chriſt, as he was a man, who was to die for us: But *Aaron* repreſented Chriſt, as he was God, offering his body in Sacrifice to his Father for our ſins. Prieſts therefore boaſting themſelves of ſacrificing Chriſt, advance themſelves above Chriſt.

8. In all Sacrifices the thing ſacrificed and offered unto God, muſt be deſtroyed and killed. But in the

---

* Bellar. li. 2. de Miſſa cap. 1. §. Secundo. Chriſtus nunc nec mereri nec ſatisfacere poteſt, ſed tantum impetrare. Igitur impetratio propria eſt hujus ſacrificii vis & efficientia.

Maſs

Maſs Chriſt is not deſtroyed and ſuffereth nothing there. Therefore in the Maſs Chriſt is not ſacrificed. To ſay that in the Maſs Chriſt's ſacramental being is deſtroyed, is a pure mockery. For Chriſt hath but one being, to wit, his natural being. And this word of *Sacramental being* is as much as a *ſignificative being*, which is a Chimera or fond conceit. The principal is that in the Maſs they pretend to ſacrifice Chriſt for our redemption. But the Sacramental or Significative being of the Lord is not the price of our redemption, and is not ſacrificed for us. That if the Sacrifice be made when the ſpecies of the bread and wine are deſtroyed, we muſt ſay that the Sacrifice is made in the ſtomach of the Prieſt ſome hours after the Maſs is ended: For there muſt be ſome time for to deſtroy the *ſpecies* by the digeſtion.

9. Furthermore in all Sacrifices the thing ſacrificed muſt be conſecrated, and in every Sacrifice there muſt be ſome Conſecration. But in the Maſs there is nothing conſecrated. Not the bread, for they hold it is no more bread. Not Chriſt's body, for men cannot conſecrate him: It is he that conſecrateth us. Not the accidents of bread; for they be not offered to God in Sacrifice; otherwiſe the Maſs would be a Sacrifice of accidents, of colour, of ſavour, of lines, and ſuperficies.

10. Our adverſaries never find themſelves more puzzled, than when they are put to find in the inſtitution of this Sacrament, ſome action wherein this Sacrifice doth conſiſt, by which they pretend that the conſecrated Hoſt is ſacrificed to God in propitiatory Sacrifice. Doth this Sacrifice conſiſt in the words whereby the Prieſt preſenteth the body of Chriſt unto God, and prays him to have that offering acceptable? But we have ſeen in the foregoing Chapter that our Adverſaries do confeſs, that Chriſt made not that oblation, and preſented nothing to God his Father. Doth this Sacrifice conſiſt in the fraction of the bread? But that is impoſſible; for Chriſt broke the bread before he uttered the words of Conſecration, therefore he

he broke no conſecrated Hoſt. And when the Prieſt lets the Hoſt fall whole into the Chalice without breaking it, the Maſs leaveth not for that to be called a Sacrifice, as *Bellarmin* * acknowledgeth. Perhaps they will ſay the Sacrifice conſiſteth in the manducation: But that cannot be. For eating is not ſacrificing. That if eating be ſacrificing, every one of the people ſhall be a ſacrificing Prieſt: and the people's mouths ſhall be as many altars. Under *Moſes*'s Law in all the ſacrifices, after which the people did eat of the things ſacrificed, the ſacred feaſt was made ſome hours after the Sacrifice was ended. Neither can the Sacrifice conſiſt in the pronouncing of the words of Conſecration: For by theſe words *This is my body*, the Prieſt offereth nothing to God. But every Sacrifice is an offering made unto God. Furthermore, in every Sacrifice, he that ſacrificeth, addreſſeth himſelf to God, but theſe words are addreſſed to the bread. Which is more, we have ſeen here above the Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, acknowledging that in all this action Chriſt offered nothing to God. Therefore he made no Sacrifice.

11. It is to be noted that in the *Roman* Church the order of Prieſthood is a Sacrament, whoſe inſtitution they will have to be found in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, when the Lord ſaid, *Do this*, as if Chriſt by one and the ſame words had inſtituted two Sacraments. With as much abſurdity, as if one would needs find the inſtitution of Marriage or of Extream Unction in the inſtitution of Baptiſm. That if theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, be the formal and expreſs words whereby Chriſt conferred the order of prieſthood, how comes it to paſs that the Biſhops, when they do confer that order in the ember weeks, make no mention of theſe words at all?

---

* Bellar. lib 1. de Miſſa. cap. 27. § 60. Si forte panis conſecratus in calicem decidat, non ſolet frangi, ſed relinquitur ita integrum uſque ad ſumptionem, nec tamen ſacrificium irritum, aut eſſentialiter immutari creditur. Adde quod hac cæremonia Dominus non videtur eſſe uſus.

12. Our Adverſaries put two ſorts of ſacrifice. The one bloody, the other unbloody, which they call the *Sacrifice of Melchiſedeck*, and which they ſay to be far more excellent than the bloody ſacrifice, and will have the Maſs to be the ſacrifice after the order of *Melchiſedeck*. Whence followeth that the Maſs is more excellent than Chriſt's death, which is a bloody Sacrifice. It is great wonder then that the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* ſpeaking ſo at large of the prieſthood of *Melchiſedeck*, maketh not any mention at all of Maſs, nor of Euchariſt.

13. But how is it that by theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Chriſt ſhould command men to ſacrifice him in the Maſs, ſince it is impoſſible to ſacrifice Chriſt in remembrance of Chriſt? ſeeing alſo that St. *Paul* immediately after theſe words, addeth the explication of them, ſaying, *For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death*, 1 Cor. 11. He teacheth us that to *Do this*, is to eat bread and drink the cup in remembrance of the Lord's death.

Here therefore every man that fears God, and loves the Lord Jeſus, ſhall conſider what a crime it is for mortal men and ſinners to intrude and take upon themſelves to ſacrifice the eternal Son of God to his Father, and to be prieſts after the order of *Melchiſedeck*, without charge and without commiſſion.

CHAP. XXXIV. *In what ſenſe the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice. Of* Melchiſedeck's *Sacrifice. And of the Oblation whereof* Malachy *ſpeakith.*

THE holy Scripture calleth our alms, our prayers, our praiſes and thankſgivings, and generally what worſhip ſoever we render unto God, *Sacrifices*. In this ſenſe the holy Supper may be called a ſacrifice. For the queſtion between us and our adverſaries, is not whether the Euchariſt may be called a ſacrifice: but whether it be truly and properly a ſacrifice of redemption, and whether the Prieſts in the Maſs ſacri-

fice the body of Chriſt really and truly for the ſins of the quick and of the dead.

Touching that our Adverſaries bring no manner of proof out of the New Teſtament, wherein nevertheleſs the inſtitution of this ſacrifice ſhould appear. Only they alledge out of the Old Teſtament, the example of *Melchiſedeck*, who as they ſay ſacrificed bread and wine, *Gen.* 14. 18. which they produce falſely, for that place ſaith no ſuch thing. *Melchiſedeck* brought out bread and wine to *Abraham* for to refreſh his wearied troops, but offered not bread and wine to *Abraham* in Sacrifice. The very bible of the *Roman* Church hath *proferens* and not *offerens*. Nevertheleſs we will ſuppoſe that place to be faithfully alledged. For if the Maſs be the ſacrifice of *Melchiſedeck*, it will follow that the Maſs is a ſacrifice of bread and wine, and not of fleſh and bones and blood. From thence it followeth alſo that the Maſs is not a ſacrifice of redemption. For bread and wine offered up in ſacrifice cannot be the price of our redemption. It were an abuſe to think that *Melchiſedeck* hath ſacrificed bread for the redemption of any one. The propitiatory ſacrifices, under the old Teſtament, were made by the death of the victim: and no propitiation was made without ſhedding of blood, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. 22. In ſum, it is to ſpeak againſt the common ſenſe, to argue thus: '*Melchiſe-*
'*deck* offered bread and wine: Therefore the Prieſt
'ſacrificeth the Lord's body and blood.'

They object likewiſe a place of *Malachy*, chap. 1. Wherein God promiſeth that in every place, *Incenſe ſhall be offered unto his Name, and a pure offering*. Which is a Prophecy of the calling of the *Gentiles*, whereby God foretells that among the nations, an acceptable ſervice ſhall be offered unto him. Of the Sacrifice of the Lord's body, he ſpeaketh nothing of it. The novelty of this ſervice is, that it ſhall be made among all nations, whereas in *Malachy*'s time it was but made in the Jewiſh nation.

They ſay alſo that the Paſſover of the Old Teſtament was a ſacrifice, and by conſequent that the Lord's

Supper, that ſucceeded thereunto, muſt be a Sacrifice. They ſpeak with as much reaſon, as if I ſhould ſay that the night muſt be clear, becauſe it ſucceedeth to the day which is bright and clear, and that old age is ſtrong and luſty, ſeeing it ſucceedeth to young age which is ſtrong and luſty. The ſucceſſion of one thing unto another, bringeth commonly great alterations. Add to this that our adverſaries will not have the Maſs to be ſuch a Sacrifice as that Paſſover was. For the Paſſover was not offered by the Prieſts, and was not made upon the altar of the temple: it was a domeſtical ſacrifice which particular men made at home in their own houſes; As it appeareth by the Paſſover which Chriſt did celebrate among his diſciples, in which no Prieſt was employed. And even though by this example our adverſaries had proved that the Euchariſt is a Sacrifice: yet there would remain for them to prove that in this Sacrifice Chriſt's body is really ſacrificed.

CHAP. XXXV. *In what ſenſe the Fathers have called the Euchariſt a Sacrifice.*

THE antient Fathers endeavouring to draw the *Heathen* unto the Chriſtian Faith, who eſteemed there is no religion without ſacrifice, and the *Jews* whoſe religion under the Old Teſtament did chiefly conſiſt in Sacrifices, have called the holy Supper a Sacrifice, and the ſacred Table an Altar, and thoſe that ſerve at it, *Levites.*

But they ſhew ſufficiently how they call the holy Supper a Sacrifice, ſince they call it *Euchariſt*, that is to ſay thankſgiving, and not a Sacrifice of Propitiation. St. *Auſtin* calleth it indeed the Sacrifice of our price in the ninth Book of Confeſſions, Chapter 12. But we have produced a multitude of places out of the ſame Father, that ſay, that in matter of Sacraments the ſigns are wont to take the name of the things ſignified. That this is the ſenſe and meaning of the Fathers when they ſpeak thus, appeareth in that they call alſo the Euchariſt Chriſt's death. As *Cyprian* in his 63 Epiſtle,

'* The Lord's Paſſion is the Sacrifice we do offer.' And *Chryſoſtom* in the 21 Homily upon the Acts of the Apoſtles, '† Whilſt this death is perfecting, and 'this dreadful Sacrifice, and theſe ineffable myſteries.' And ſo the Canon *Hoc eſt*, in the 2d Diſtinction of the Conſecration, '‡ The immolation of Chriſt's fleſh 'which is made by the hands of the Prieſt, is called 'the Paſſion, Death, and Crucifixion of Chriſt, not 'according to the truth, but by a ſignificant myſtery.'

Auſtin in his 23 Epiſtle to *Bonifacius*: 'Was not 'Chriſt once ſacrificed in himſelf? and yet he is ſa-'crificed to the People in a ſacred ſign.' And in his 10 Book of the City of God, Chap. 5. '‖ The vi-'ſible Sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is to ſay a ſacred 'ſign of the inviſible Sacrifice.' And a little after, '‖‖ That which men do call Sacrifice, is a ſign of 'the true Sacrifice.' Note, that he ſaith, that men do call it a ſacrifice, acknowledging tacitly the holy Scripture doth not call it ſo, We have then in theſe places of St. *Auſtin*, a clear expoſition of this place wherein he calleth the Euchariſt *the Sacrifice of our price.*

The ſixth Book of *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* of *Clemens*, Chap. 23. '** The Lord inſtead of a bloody 'Sacrifice hath inſtituted a reaſonable, and unbloody, 'and myſtical Sacrifice, which is celebrated in conſi-'deration of the Lord's death by the ſigns of his body 'and blood.'

---

* Paſſio eſt Domini ſacrificium quod offerimus.

† Τῦ θανάτυ ἐκείνυ, ἐπιτελυμένυ, τῆς φρικτῆς θυσίας, τῶν ἀφάτων μυςηρίων.

‡ Vocatur ipſa immolatio carnis quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit, Chriſti paſſio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio.

‖ Sacrificium viſibile inviſibilis Sacrificii Sacramentum id eſt ſacrum ſignum.

‖‖ Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur Sacrificium, eſt ſignum veri ſacrificii.

** Pro ſacrificio cruento rationale & incruentum ac myſticum ſacrificium inſtituit, quod in mortem Domini per ſymbola corporis et ſanguinis ſui celebratur.

In the 4 Book of Sacraments attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, Chap. 5. We have theſe words of the antient Service : ‡ 'Grant that this oblation be imputed unto us, as reaſonable, acceptable, which is the 'FIGURE of the body and blood of the Lord.' The ſucceeding ages have razed out the word *Figure*.

Procopius Gazæus upon the 49 Chap. of *Geneſis*, 'Chriſt gave to his Diſciples the Image, or Figure, 'and Type of his body and blood, receiving no more 'the bloody Sacrifices of the Law.'

Euſebius in the 10 Chapter of his firſt Book of *the Evangelical Demonſtration*. ' † The Lord having offered a Sacrifice and an excellent victim unto his Father for the ſalvation of us all, hath appointed us to 'offer continually the remembrance of it inſtead of a 'Sacrifice.'

And in the ſame place, ' § We have received the 'remembrance of this Sacrifice for to celebrate it at 'his own table, by the ſigns of his Body and Blood, 'according to the inſtitution of the New Teſtament.'

In a word, the Fathers are full of ſuch places. Wherefore in the Euchariſt they put no difference between the Sacrament and the Sacrifice. But to ſpeak properly, there is ſuch difference between a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, as between giving and receiving: For in a Sacrifice we offer unto God, but in a Sacrament we receive from God. The Fathers do not make this diſtinction. For by reaſon the Sacrament is a ſign and a figure of the Sacrifice, they call the Sacrament a Sacrifice.

---

‡ Fac nobis hanc oblationem aſcriptam, rationabilem acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis & ſanguinis Domini.

† Θαυμάσιον θύμα καὶ σφαγιον ἐξαίρετον τῳ πατρὶ καλλιερησαμενος, ὁ ὑπερ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν αὐτὸς σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας, τῶ θεῶ εἰκικῶς προσφέρειν.

§ Τέτῳ τῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τῦ σώματος αὐτῦ καὶ τῦ σωτηρίυ ἄιματος, κατὰ θεσμὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες.

This

This kind of ſpeaking, to call the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice, had its beginning from the offerings and gifts, which in old time the people offered upon the ſacred table afore the Communion, which gifts were commonly called Sacrifices and Oblations. *Cyprian* in his Sermon of Alms, * chides a rich woman that had brought no Sacrifice, and yet took her part of the Sacrifices the poor had brought. And in the 21 Diſtinction at the Canon *Cleros*, † 'Let the Subdeacons in the Lord's Temple receive the Oblations of 'the faithful, and carry them to the Levites, that 'they may put them upon the Altars.' Which manner of ſpeech remains yet at this day in the Maſs, wherein the Prieſt before the Conſecration, ſaith, *Receive, Lord, this immaculate Hoſt, &c.* as is acknowledged by *Bellarmin* in his firſt book of the Maſs, Chapter 27. And he proves it by *Ireneus*, who in the 4 Book, Chap. 32, ſaith, we offer unto God a Sacrifice of his creatures, that is to ſay, bread and wine: And that, even before the Conſecration.

In that therefore, the Fathers have ſaid nothing but what is agreeable and conformable unto the Faith. Yet nevertheleſs the abuſe that hath followed thereon a long time after, is unto us an excellent example that the ſafeſt way is to cleave to the Apoſtles language, and not to depart from the ſtile of the holy Scripture.

---

* Locuples & Dives, Dominicum celebrare te credis quæ corbonum non reſpicis, quæ in Dominicum ſine ſacrificio venis, quæ partem de ſacrificio quod pauper obtulit ſumis.

† Hypodiaconi oblationes in templo Domini à fidelibus ſuſcipiant, & Levitis ſuperponendas altaribus deferant.

THE SECOND BOOK. OF THE MANDUCATION OF The Body of *CHRIST.*

CHAP. I. *Of the two ſorts of manducation of Chriſt's fleſh, to wit, Spiritual and Corporal, and which is the beſt.*

METAPHORS are ſimilies contracted and reduced to a word. So we ſay *feeding*, for *teaching*, and *to flouriſh* for *to be in proſperity*, and we call pride a ſwelling, and truth a light. We ſay of a child's tongue, that it is untied, and of his wit, that it is diſplayed.

Theſe Metaphors, beſides the ornament, have ſome utility. For they propoſe an Image of the things whereof we ſpeak, and make them more intelligible by a tacit compariſon. Specially, it is a thing very uſual and frequent, to expreſs the functions and qualities of the ſoul, by terms borrowed from the actions and corporal qualities. So we ſay that envy freteth, that love burneth, that covetouſneſs is a thirſt of money, and that hope is a tickling or ſoothing.

The

The holy Scripture is full of ſuch manner of ſpeeches, wherein nothing is more frequent than to ſpeak of good inſtructions as of meats and drinks, and of the graces of God, as of a water that quencheth the thirſt, and of the deſire of theſe graces as of an hunger and thirſt. So in the 9th of *Proverbs* the ſupream wiſdom ſaith, *Come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled.* And *David* in the 36 *Pſalm* ſaith, *God makes us drink in the river of his pleaſures.* And in the 34 *Pſalm*, *O taſte and ſee that the Lord is good.* And *Jeremy*, in the 15th Chapter, *Thy words were found, and I did preſently eat them.* And God himſelf in the 55 of *Iſaiah*, inviteth the thirſty to drink of the waters. And that it may be underſtood he ſpeaks of a ſpiritual drink, he adds, *Encline your ear, and your ſoul ſhall live.* According to this kind of ſpeech, St. *Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle, Chapter 2, exhorts us to deſire *the milk of intelligence*, to wit, the word of God. And St. *Paul* in the firſt to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 3, ſaith he hath given them *milk, and not ſolid meat.* Chriſt our Lord is he that hath uſed very often ſuch metaphors, taken from corporal meats and drinks. He ſaith in the 4 Chap. of St. *John*, that *his meat is to do his Father's will.* And in the ſame Chapter he promiſeth to give *water, whereof whoſoever ſhall drink, ſhall never thirſt.* And in Chap. 7. 37. *If any man thirſt, let him come unto me, and drink.* And in the 5 Chapter of St. *Matthew*, *Bleſſed are they which do hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs.*

With ſuch manner of figurative ſpeeches is woven and interlaced a great part of the 6 Chapter of St. *John*, where the Lord ſpeaking to the *Capernaites* promiſeth to give them the bread of Heaven, and ſaith that his fleſh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed. Two occaſions moved him to ſpeak ſo. For the Jews of *Capernaum* making him inferior to *Moſes*, and objecting unto him, as by reproach of impotency, that *Moſes* had given unto the Jews the *Manna* which they call the bread of Heaven: The Lord from thence takes occaſion to tell them he would give them another bread deſcended from Heaven, far

better than the *Manna*, to wit, himſelf, come down from Heaven for to be the food of ſouls, and for to vivify them. The other cauſe that moved him to ſpeak in figured terms, is that he was ſpeaking unto ungrateful and rebellious Jews, on whom St. *Matthew* ſaith, *he ſpake not without a parable*, *Matthew* 13. 34.

Here our Adverſaries acknowledge with us, that there is a manner of eating the body of Chriſt which is ſpiritual, and which is done not by the corporal mouth, but by the Faith in Chriſt Jeſus, in whom we find our life and ſpiritual food. The Council of *Trent* in the XIII. Seſſion, Chap. 8, teaches the ſame, ſaying: 'Some eat this bread, only ſpiritual-'ly and by a lively faith.'

But beſides this ſpiritual manducation, the Church of *Rome* forgeth to herſelf a corporal manducation, whereby the faithful in the Euchariſt do chew and eat with their very teeth the body of our Saviour Chriſt, and take it with the corporal mouth, and make him to enter into their ſtomachs, and do call this a real and true manducation, for to oppoſe it to the ſpiritual manducation, whereof they ſpeak very often with contempt, as of a picture and of a thing which conſiſts only in imagination. The Council of *Trent* intimates ſo much tacitly, ſaying, there be ſome that eat this bread only ſpiritually, as if it were a ſmall thing in compariſon of the real eating of it by the mouth of the body.

Yet nevertheleſs when we preſs them a little, they are forced to avow that the ſpiritual manducation is a great deal better: And that the corporal manducation, which they maintain and defend ſo ſtiffly and with ſo much ardour, is a ſmall thing in regard of the ſpiritual. For they confeſs that many are ſaved without partaking of the Euchariſt, but that none are ſaved without believing in Chriſt. And that many eat the Sacrament, which nevertheleſs do periſh eternally: But that whoſoever eateth Chriſt's fleſh ſpiritually and with true Faith, ſhall have eternal ſalvation, according to the Lord's ſaying in the third Chapter of St. *John*, that

that *whoſoever believeth on him, ſhall not periſh, but have eternal life.* Which is more, our Adverſaries do acknowledge with us, that the manducation of the Sacrament, without the ſpiritual manducation by faith, is not only unprofitable, but even turns into condemnation; and that it is profitable and uſeful, but for, and becauſe of the ſpiritual manducation. But the ſpiritual manducation, by itſelf alone, and without the corporal manducation, leaves not to be profitable, and always neceſſary to ſalvation. The manducation of the Sacrament, by the mouth of the body, is common both to good and bad, and hypocrites partake thereof as well as the true faithful: Yea our Adverſaries hold that beaſts may eat Chriſt's body, and that Mice do carry away ſometimes the body of the Lord: But the ſpiritual manducation, is proper and peculiar to God's Children, and none but the true faithful can be partakers thereof. Chriſt in the 15 of St. *Matthew* ſaith, *That which goeth into the mouth, defileth not a man:* Whence follows that neither can it ſanctify a man.

In this, St. *Auſtin* is far from that language which the *Roman* Church holdeth now a days, who acknowledgeth no other true and real manducation of Chriſt's body, than that which is made by the bodily mouth in the Euchariſt. For this holy man on the contrary, holdeth that there is no other true and real manducation of Chriſt's body, but the ſpiritual: And that that which is done in the Sacrament by the mouth of the body, is not a true manducation. He teacheth it in his 21 Book of the *City of God*, Chap. 25. * *The Lord* (ſaith he) *ſheweth what it is to eat the body of Chriſt, not in Sacrament only, but in truth.* And in the ſame place, ‡ *They have eaten the body of Chriſt, not only in Sacrament, but alſo truly and indeed.* To this holy Doctor, *Thomas* joins himſelf in this point, in his 7

* Dominus oſtendit quid ſit non Sacramento tenus ſed re vera corpus Chriſti manducare.

‡ Non ſolo Sacramento, ſed re vera manducaverunt corpus Chriſti.

leſſon

leſſon upon the 6th of St. *John*, where ſpeaking of him that eateth ſpiritually the body of Chriſt, he ſaith, * *It is that man that eateth the body of Chriſt, not only Sacramentally, but alſo in Truth.*

CHAP. II. *That in the 6th Chapter of St. John the Lord ſpeaks not of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, nor of the manducation of his fleſh by the mouth of the body.*

BY the corporal manducation, we underſtand the manducation of the bread and wine, which Chriſt hath honoured with the title of his body and blood, becauſe they are the Sacrament and remembrance of the ſame. But our Adverſaries pretend to eat really the body of Chriſt with their mouth, and to make him paſs into their ſtomach: and for to prop this ſo groſs and *Capernaitiſh* manducation, they alledge the ſixth of Saint *John*, where Chriſt ſaith that he is the bread come down from Heaven, and promiſeth to give his fleſh to eat.

1. For to believe that, a man muſt of purpoſe put out his own eyes, and give the Son of God the lye: For all this diſcourſe is addreſſed and ſpoken to the Jews of *Capernaum*, to whom he promiſeth to give his fleſh to eat. If by theſe words he had promiſed to give them the Euchariſt, he would have deceived them: for he never adminiſtred nor preſented the holy Supper unto them.

2. That appeareth by the time wherein the Lord held this diſcourſe. It was when the holy Supper was not as yet inſtituted: no, nor till about two years after. How could the Lord's Diſciples have underſtood that he ſpoke of the Euchariſt unto them, which was not, and whereof he had never ſpoken before?

3. Where is there in all this diſcourſe of the Lord the leaſt mention of a Table, or of a Chalice, or of

---

* Hic eſt ille, qui non Sacramentaliter tantum ſed re vera corpus Chriſti manducat.

a Sup-

a Supper, or of a fraction of bread, or of a diſtribution of the Sacrament among many? In ſum, of any of the actions wherein the adminiſtration of this Sacrament doth conſiſt?

4. It is to be noted that Chriſt ſpeaketh often in the preſent tenſe. He doth not ſay, *I ſhall be the bread* * come down from heaven: and 'I ſhall be the bread 'of life. But, 'I am the bread come down from hea-'ven:' and, 'I am the bread of life.' And, 'he that 'eateth my fleſh, hath eternal life.' He was then the bread of life before the holy Supper was inſtituted, and might have been eaten then, and was the food of the Soul, when the holy Supper had as yet no being.

5. Now that by *eating* and *drinking* the Lord meaneth to believe and to truſt in him, and thereby to be nouriſhed and vivified: he ſhews it himſelf, ſaying in the 35 Verſe, 'I am the bread of life; he that 'cometh to me, ſhall never hunger: and he that be-'lieveth on me, ſhall never thirſt.' Who ſees not that in this place, believing is put for *drinking*, ſince by believing the thirſt is quenched? And as by that word of *coming* he ſpeaketh of a ſpiritual coming: ſo by that word, *drinking*, he meaneth and under-ſtandeth a kind of ſpiritual drinking.

6. And when the Lord ſaith in the 47 and 48 Verſe, 'He that believeth in me, hath eternal life: I am 'the bread of life:' Who ſees not that this bread is taken in and by believing? For Chriſt ſheweth how he is the bread of life, to wit becauſe he that believes on him hath eternal life.

7. The very words whereupon our adverſaries ground themſelves moſt, are thoſe which make moſt againſt them. In the 53 Verſe the Lord ſaith, 'Ex-'cept ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink 'his blood, ye have no life in you.' There it is evident he ſpeaks of a manducation neceſſary unto ſalvation, and without which none can be ſaved. He ſpeaks

* John 6. 33. and chap. 35, and 14.

not

not therefore of the manducation of the Sacrament by the mouth of the body, ſeeing that without it ſo many are ſaved. Now to ſay that this corporal manducation is neceſſary, not indeed, but in vow and deſire, is to come near our belief, and reduce that neceſſity to the ſpiritual manducation. Moreover, to ſay that none are ſaved without deſiring to be partakers of the holy Communion, is to exclude from ſalvation, *John* the Baptiſt, and the good *Thief* crucified with the Lord, who never participated thereof, neither in deed nor in vow. And we might bring many examples of * *Pagans* and *Idolaters*, who by hearing of the words of the Martyrs, were converted at the ſame inſtant, and put to death at that very hour, without any body ever having told them of this Sacrament, and conſequently without having made any vow at all to be made partakers thereof. Yea many have ſuffered Martyrdom without being baptized, and by conſequent very far from diſpoſing themſelves to receive the Euchariſt.

8. The ſame appeareth by that which Chriſt addeth in the 54 Verſe. 'He that eateth my fleſh, 'hath eternal life.' He ſpeaketh not of the manducation of the Sacrament: For many that eat it have not eternal life. Their ordinary evaſion is, that Chriſt ſpeaketh of him that eateth his fleſh worthily. Wherein appeareth how ſtrong the truth is on our ſide. For according to our belief, the Lord's words are true without any addition. But our Adverſaries do add ſome gloſſes for to eſcape and ſave themſelves. Which addition they make of their own head, without the word of God. One may well eat the bread unworthily, as Saint *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 11. 'Whoſoever eateth this bread unworthily.' But it is impoſſible to eat the Lord's fleſh unworthily, ſince *to eat* is *to believe*, as we have ſhewed. A man cannot believe in Chriſt unworthily, no more than to love God unworthily: ſince that in believing in Chriſt,

* Read the Homily of the 40 martyrs in Baſil.

and

and in loving of God, conſiſteth all our dignity. Cardinal *Cajetan* obſerveth the ſame, upon the ſixth of Saint *John*, ſaying, 'Chriſt doth not ſay, He 'that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood worthily, 'but he that eateth and drinketh: To the end we may 'underſtand that he ſpeaketh of a meat and of a 'drink that hath no need of modification, *&c.*' It appeareth then plainly that this ſpeech is not to be underſtood literally, and that the Lord ſpeaketh not of eating and drinking the Sacrament, but of believing and of feeding ſpiritually by faith in his death.

9. The Lord addeth in the 56 Verſe, 'He that 'eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in 'me and I in him.' Words that decide this queſtion: For they would be falſe if they ſhould be taken and underſtood of the manducation of the Sacrament: it being a thing moſt certain that profane men and hypocrites which receive the Sacrament, dwell not in Chriſt, nor Chriſt in them. Now to dwell in Chriſt, is to be conjoined to him with an union conſtant and continual and mutual between Chriſt and the believer. As *Cornelius Janſenius*, Biſhop of *Gant*, teacheth very well. * 'He (ſaith he) that eateth my 'fleſh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I 'in him: that is to ſay, he is conjoined unto me in-'ſeparably and intimately, and I to him:' and proves it by other places of Saint *John* in his firſt Epiſtle. 4 16. 'He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God 'in him.' And in the ſame place, 'Hereby we know 'that we dwell in him, and he in us, becauſe he hath 'given us of his Spirit.' And in the third Chapter, 24 Verſe, he ſaith, that 'he that keepeth his Com-'mandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him.' From whence he inferreth that alſo in this 6 Chapter of Saint *John*, the Lord ſpeaks of a kind of eating, which is proper unto thoſe that have a faith working through

* Concord. Evang ca. 59. Qui edit carnem meam & bibit meum ſanguinem, in me manet, & ego in eo; hoc eſt indivulſe & intime mihi conjungitur, & ego illi.

charity,

charity, and not of a corporal manducation, whereof wicked men are partakers.

10. That if for to make Chriſt to dwell in us, he muſt be eaten by the mouth of the body: Chriſt by the ſame reaſon muſt eat us, that we may dwell in him.

11. Chriſt, for to divert and turn away our minds from carnal thoughts, addeth in the 63 Verſe, 'The 'fleſh profiteth nothing, It is the Spirit that quick-'neth.' Since that by the *ſpirit* he meaneth his Spirit whereby he regenerateth us, by the fleſh alſo he underſtandeth his human body: Whereof he ſaith that it profiteth nothing, to wit, being taken after that manner as the *Capernaites* did imagine themſelves. What would it profit a man to have in his ſtomach the head and feet of Chriſt Jeſus, whether he do ſwallow him by pieces and parcels, or do ſwallow him whole? For the abſurdity is alike.

12. Chriſt addeth, *The words that I have ſpoken unto you are ſpirit and life*,' that is to ſay, are ſpiritual and quickening. They are not quickning but to them that underſtand them ſpiritually, and that imagine not a carnal and corporal manducation. So teacheth Saint *Auſtin* in his 27 Treatiſe upon Saint *John*. He demandeth, * 'What meaneth theſe words, Are 'ſpirit and life?' His anſwer is, 'That they muſt 'be underſtood ſpiritually. Haſt thou underſtood 'them ſpiritually? They are ſpirit and life unto thee. 'Haſt thou underſtood them carnally? In this man-'ner they be alſo ſpirit and life, but not unto thee.'

13. And upon that the *Capernaites* and ſome of the Lord's Diſciples were ſcandalized, and ſaid that theſe words were an hard ſaying, he ſaith unto them, ‡ *What and if ye ſhall ſee then the Son of man*

* Quid eſt, ſpiritus & vita ſunt? Reſpondet. Spiritualiter intelligenda ſunt. Intellexiſti ſpiritualiter? ſpiritus & vita ſunt. Intellexiſti carnaliter? etiam ſic ſpiritus & vita ſunt, ſed tibi non ſunt.

‡ Illi putabant eum erogaturum corpus ſuum, ille autem dixit ſe aſcenſurum in cœlum, utiquè integrum. Cum videritis Filium hominis aſcendentem ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis erogat corpus ſuum. Certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non conſumitur morſibus.

aſcend

aſcend where he was before? Which words Saint *Auſtin* in the ſame Treatiſe explaineth thus, 'What 'meaneth that? Thereby he reſolveth that which had 'moved them. They thought he would give them 'his body, but he ſaith unto them that he would aſ-'cend up to heaven, to wit, whole and entire. When 'ye have ſeen the ſon of man aſcending where he 'was before, certainly then at leaſt ſhall ye ſee that 'he giveth not his body as ye think, then at the 'leaſt ſhall ye underſtand that his grace is not conſumed 'with biting.

CHAP. III. *That the Roman Church, by this doctrine, depriveth the people of Salvation.*

THAT which grieves our adverſaries moſt, in all this diſcourſe of the Lord, is this clauſe of the 53 Verſe, 'Verily I ſay unto you, Except ye eat the 'fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood, ye have 'no life in you.' For if by theſe words Chriſt doth ſpeak of the participation of the Sacrament, it follows that the people of the *Roman* Church, whom they have deprived of the cup, ſhall have no life, and are loſt eternally: for they drink not Chriſt's blood. To ſay, as *Bellarmin* doth, that the People takes the blood in the Hoſt, is to ſay juſt nothing. For Chriſt commandeth not only to take his blood, but alſo commandeth to drink it. If he ſpeaketh of the Sacrament, he commandeth men not only to be partakers of his blood, but alſo declareth the kind and manner how he will have them to participate thereof; for, *to drink*, is the kind and manner of participating thereof. Briefly, he commandeth to drink. But to eat a dry Hoſt or wafer, is not to drink. That if to eat is to drink, the Prieſt drinketh twice in the Maſs, once in taking the Hoſt, and another time in taking the Cup. Unto which the common ſenſe contradicteth: and Pope *Innocent* the third too, in his fourth Book of the myſteries of the Maſs, Chapter 21. 'Neither 'is the blood drunk (ſaith he) under the ſpecies of the 'bread, nor the body eaten under the ſpecies of the 'wine.'

'wine.' Here then our Adverſaries do forge an abſurd figure, whereby *to drink*, ſignifieth *to eat*. Every where elſe they do diſtinguiſh *eating* from *drinking*: but here they confound them as if they were all one. Indeed to eat and to drink, taken in a ſpiritual ſenſe, ſignifieth one and the ſame thing. But when the queſtion is of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and of eating the bread and drinking the Chalice, to eat and to drink are different things. That if to eat the Hoſt be to drink: ſo to drink the Cup, ſhall be to eat the Cup. And if drinking be taken figuratively, why not alſo the word eating?

Here the Truth is ſo ſtrong, that *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit ſticks not to diſpute with might and main againſt *Bellarmin*, who ſaith that the Lord commandeth only the participation of his blood, but not the manner of participating thereunto. * 'I do not approve (ſaith he) 'of this anſwer, becauſe the words of the Lord have 'not only reference unto the thing that is taken, but 'to the manner of taking it. For to eat and to drink, 'if the words be taken properly, cannot agree with 'any ſpecie whatſoever. For the blood is not ſaid to 'be drunk under the ſpecies of the bread, no more 'than the body is eaten under the ſpecies of the wine, 'as *Innocent* the third obſerveth very well in his 4th 'Book, chap. 21.

And he addeth a thing very conſiderable, to wit, that from this anſwer of *Bellarmin*, who will have this word *drinking*, to be taken improperly, it will follow that in the whole chapter there ſhall not be a word ſpoken of the Cup.

---

* Vaſquez. in III. partem, Tomo 3. Diſp. 206 num 10. Hoc reſponſum mihi non probatur, quia verba Domini non tantum referuntur ad rem ſumptam, ſed ad modum ſumendi eam. Nam manducare & bibere, ſi verba proprie uſurpentur, cuivis ſpecie convenire non poſſunt; neque eram ſanguis ſub ſpecie panis bibi dicitur: ſicut neque corpus ſub ſpecie vini manducari, ut optime notat Innocent. III. lib. 4. de Myſteriis Miſſæ quamvis ſumi dicatur, Chriſtus autem præcipit ut bibamus.

Salmeron

Salmeron another Jeſuit, is of the ſame opinion, ſaying, 'that he that drinketh not, drinketh not 'the blood, though he do take the fleſh and blood.'

But the ſame Jeſuits that conteſt againſt their own fellows, bring no better things themſelves. They ſay that when Chriſt ſaid, 'Except ye drink my blood, 'ye have no life in you,' he bindeth the people to drink the Cup, and that they drink it indeed in as much as the Prieſt drinketh for the people, and repreſenteth the whole Church when he drinketh. By this reaſon, the people might as well forbear eating, and be contented that the Prieſt ſhould eat for them. For the commandment for eating, in this place, is not more expreſs than that of drinking. By the ſame means, when Chriſt commands the people to believe in him, the people may diſpenſe themſelves from believing in Chriſt, ſaying, it ſufficeth that the Prieſt believe for others, for he repreſenteth the whole Church: In a word, it is an impious temerity and preſumption to add out of ones own authority unto the words of the Lord, whole clauſes, yea abſurd clauſes, as if Chriſt had ſaid, 'Except ye drink my 'blood your own ſelves, or by another, ye ſhall have 'no life in you.'

With the like licence they ſay that when Chriſt ſaid, 'Except ye eat my fleſh AND drink my blood,' this AND muſt be turned into OR, and that Chriſt's meaning was to have ſaid, 'Except ye eat my fleſh, or 'drink my blood.' If it may be lawful to change thus the words of the Lord, there is no law in the Scripture from which a man may not diſpence himſelf. When the Law of God commands one to love God and his Neighbour, one may by the ſame reaſon ſay, that the Law meaneth that one muſt love God or his Neighbour: And when the Law ſaith, 'Honour thy Father and thy Mother,' it meaneth that one muſt honour his Father or his Mother, and

---

* Salmer. Tom. 9. Tract 24. Qui non bibit, non bibit ſanguinem, licet carnem et ſanguinem ſumat.

that

that it is enough to honour either of them. Add withal that by this depravation of the Lord's Words, it follows that the people may drink the Cup without eating the Hoſt, ſince it ſufficeth to do either of them.

CHAP. IV. *That the principal Doctors of the Roman Church, yea the Popes themſelves do agree with us in this point: and hold that in the 6th of S. John nothing is ſpoken but of the ſpiritual Manducation, and that thoſe that contradict them, do ſpeak with incertitude.*

IN this controverſy we have the Popes for us, and a great multitude of the Romiſh Doctors, who hold with us that in the 6th of S. *John*, it is not ſpoken of the Euchariſt nor of eating our Saviour Chriſt by the mouth of the body, but that Chriſt ſpeaketh of the ſpiritual manducation by Faith in Chriſt's death. Such is the opinion of Pope *Innocent* the III. and of *Pius* II. called *Æneas Sylvius* afore he came to the Papacy. Item, * of *Bonaventure*, *Cajetan*, *Cuſanus*, *De Alliaco*, *Cardinals*; Item, of *Durandus Epiſcopus Mimatenſis*, *Gabriel Biel*, *Heſſel* one of the Doctors of the Council of *Trent*, *Lindanus*, *Ruardus Taperus*, *Janſenius* Biſhop of *Gand*, *Ferus* a Divine of *Maguntia*, *Valdenſis*, and many others. Among others, *Gabriel Biel* in his 36 Leſſon upon the Canon of the Maſs, ſaith, that 'the Doctors hold with a common conſent 'that in the 6th of S. *John* no mention is made but 'of the ſpiritual manducation.' But for brevity ſake it ſhall ſuffice to produce the places of the two forenamed Popes.

* Bonaven. in 4. Diſt. 9. art. 1. q. 2. Cajet. in 6. Johannis. Cuſanus epiſt. 7. ad Bohemos. Petrus de Alliaco in 4. Sentent. q. 2. art. 3. Durant. Rationali divinor. Offic. lib. 4. c. 41. n. 40. Lindanus Panopliæ l. 4. c. 58. Tapper. in explic. articulorum 15. Lovanenſium. Janſen. Concord. c. 59. Ferus in 26. Matthæi & 6 Johannis. Valdenſis Tomo 2 de Sacram. c. 91. Heſſel. de communione ſub utraque ſpecie.

Pope

Pope *Innocent* 3. in the 14th chap. of his fourth Book of the Myſteries of the Maſs hath theſe words: ‘ * The Lord ſpeaketh of the ſpiritual manducation, ‘ ſaying, ‘ Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man ‘ and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. In ‘ this manner, the good only do eat the body of ‘ Chriſt.’

A learned Pope is a very rare thing. Yet of *Pius* II. one may ſay that he was one of the learnedeſt of his age. The ſame *Pius* in his 130 Epiſtle to Cardinal *Carviall*, diſputing againſt the *Bohemians* ſpeaketh thus, ‘ † The ſenſe of the Goſpel of *John* is not ‘ ſuch as you aſcribe unto it: For there it is not com- ‘ manded to drink at the Sacrament, but a manner ‘ of ſpiritual drinking is taught. *And a little after,* ‘ The Lord by theſe words declareth in that place ‘ the ſecret myſteries of the ſpiritual drink, and not ‘ of the carnal, when he ſaith, It is the Spirit that ‘ quickneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing: And again, ‘ The words that I ſpeak unto you, they are ſpirit and ‘ they are life. Wilt thou know openly that the ‘ Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of the ſpiritual manducation ‘ which is made by Faith? Conſider that what the ‘ Lord ſaith in the words HE THAT EATETH ‘ AND DRINKETH, are words of the preſent ‘ tenſe and not of the future. At that very inſtant ‘ therefore that the Lord was ſpeaking, there were ‘ ſome that did eat him and drink him.’ And yet the Lord had not ſuffered as yet, neither was the Sacrament inſtituted.

Thomas Aquinas, termed the Angelical Doctor, was a great worſhipper of Popes; ‖ ſo far as to accuſe

---

* De ſpirituali manducatione Dominus ait, Niſi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus ſanguinem, &c. Hoc modo corpus Chriſti ſoli boni comedunt.

† Sed non eſt in evangelio Johannis ſenſus quem ſibi aſcribitis. Non bibitio Sacramentalis ibi præſcribitur, ſed ſpiritualis inſinuatur.

‖ Thom. Opuſculo 21. c. 10. Dominus utitur in Johanne quadam interrogatione importuna ter quærens à ſuo ſucceſſore, beato Petro, quod ſi ipſum diligit, gregem paſcat.

Chriſt

Chriſt of importunity, for aſking his Vicar *Peter* thrice, *Loveſt thou me?* For which likewiſe the Pope canonized him and made him a Saint after his death. This man, though a great defender of Tranſubſtantiation, yet nevertheleſs upon this point of the manducation whereof Chriſt ſpeaketh in the 6th of S. *John*, ſpeaketh thus in his 7 Leſſon upon theſe words, 'Except ye eat my fleſh, ye have no life in you.' * 'If 'this (ſaith he) be referred to the ſpiritual manducati-'on, this ſentence is without all doubt. For that 'man eateth ſpiritually the fleſh of Chriſt and drink-'eth his blood, that is partaker of the unity of the 'Church, which is effected through love, *&c.* But if 'that hath reference to the Sacramental manducation, 'there is ſome doubt in that which is ſaid; Except 'ye eat my fleſh, ye have no life in you.'

But in this latter age the greateſt part of the *Romiſh* Doctors, eſpecially the Jeſuits, have forſaken this opinion, generally received in the Church of *Rome* in former Ages, and have contemned the authority of the fore-alledged Popes. Their opinion is, that in the 51ſt Verſe of the 6th chap. of S. *John*, Chriſt beginneth to ſpeak of the Sacramental manducation which is made by the corporal mouth; but that whatſoever is ſaid before, is to be underſtood of the ſpiritual manducation. As when Chriſt ſaith in the 33, 35, and 50 verſes, 'that he is the bread come down 'from heaven.' 'And that he is the bread of Life.' And 'that whoſoever believeth on him ſhall never 'thirſt.' And 'that he is the bread come down from 'heaven, whereof whoſoever eateth, he ſhall not 'die.' In all theſe places they grant that it is ſpoken of a manner of eating and drinking that is ſpiritual, and will have nothing there to be ſpoken of the bread of the Euchariſt, but do take all theſe words figuratively. A doctrine truly full of abſurdity, and which deſtroys and overthroweth itſelf. For what boldneſs

* Si hæc ſententia referatur ad ſpiritualem manducationem, nullam dubitationem habet ſententia, &c. Si vero ad Sacramentalem, dubium habet quod dicitur.

is

is it to forge in the ſequel or proſecution of one and the ſame diſcourſe, two kinds of manducation, and by a maſter-like authority, to will that one part of the chapter be underſtood figuratively, and the other ſimply, ſince they all be the ſame kind of ſpeeches, and that the ſame expoſition may be brought both to the one and to the other.

The Council of *Trent* was mightily peſtered about that; for after this matter had been toſſed a long time and diſputed upon at the Council, the Prelates ſeeing the new Doctors were contrary unto the old, yea even to the Popes, and that the new ones beſides did not agree among themſelves, would determine nothing therein, and left the thing undecided, as *Salmeron* the Jeſuit, who was preſent at that Council, doth teſtify. 'The Synod* (ſaith he) would not 'then determine namely which is the propereſt and 'natural ſenſe of theſe words of Chriſt in S. *John*, 'becauſe of the variety of Interpretations of the holy 'Fathers and Doctors that were brought on both 'ſides.' Yet it was there principally, that the infallible perfection of the Pope and of the Council ſhould have been diſplayed, being a matter of ſo great importance. And yet to this very day the Popes have determined nothing upon that, nor condemned thoſe that are of a contrary mind to the Jeſuits.

CHAP. V. *Reaſons of our Adverſaries for to prove that in the ſixth chap. of Saint* John *it is ſpoken of the manducation by the mouth of the Body.*

BUT let us ſee how the Doctors of this Age diſpute againſt their Popes, Cardinals and Prelates, and go about to prove that in the 6th of S. *John* is ſpoken of the manducation by the mouth of the body in the Euchariſt.

* Salmer. Tom. 8. Tract. 23. Etſi noluerit Synodus nominatim illo tempore decernere, qui eſſet maxime proprius & germanus verborum illorum Chriſti ſenſus apud Johannem, propter varias, ſanctorum Patrum et Doctorum interpretationes in utramque partem allatas, &c.

1. They

1. They ſay that Chriſt ſpeaketh in the future ſaying, *The bread that I will give*, as ſpeaking of a manducation that was not yet. I anſwer that he ſpeaketh alſo in the preſent ſaying, *I am the bread come down from Heaven. And he that eateth thereof ſhall not die.* They themſelves would laugh, if from that the Lord ſaith in the future, *Whoſoever ſhall believe and ſhall be baptiſed, ſhall be ſaved*, I ſhould infer that before Chriſt ſpoke theſe words, none believed, none were baptiſed, none were ſaved. Moreover, when Chriſt ſpeaketh in the future, ſaying, *The bread that I will give*, he hath regard to his future death, which is the true food of our Souls.

2. They ſay alſo that if this ſixth chapter of S. *John* were not taken and underſtood of the manducation by the mouth of the body: it would follow that S. *John* did not ſpeak at all of the Euchariſt. *Stapleton*, one of the moſt furious Adverſaries, anſwers for us: 'S. *John* (ſaith he) * writes nothing of the 'Euchariſtical Supper, becauſe the other three Evan-'geliſts had fully written of it before,' S. *John* wrote long after the other Evangeliſts, and did only inſiſt upon ſuch things as the others had omitted. He did not put in his Goſpel the hiſtory of the Lord's Conception and Birth, nor of his Temptation in the Wilderneſs, nor of his Baptiſm, nor of his Transfiguration in the Mount.

3. They add that Chriſt doth diſtinguiſh the eating from drinking, for to deſign the two *ſpecies* of the Euchariſt. To that I anſwer, that Chriſt ſpeaks of eating and drinking, for to give us to underſtand that we have in him and in his death a full and entire ſpiritual nouriſhment. In the 55 chap. of *Iſaiah*, 1. v. God inviteth the hungry and the thirſty to eat and to drink. And in the 22 of S. *Luke*, 30. ver. Chriſt ſaith: *I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Fa-*

* Stapl. Promptuar. Cathol. Serm. 1. Hebdom. Sanctæ. Johannes de tertia & Euchariſtica cœna nihil quidem ſcribit, eo quod cæteri tres Evangeliſtæ ante cum eam plene deſcripſiſſent.

ther

ther hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom. In theſe places, our Adverſaries do acknowledge that to eat and drink ſignifie one and the ſame thing, and that they are taken in a ſpiritual ſenſe.

4. But (ſay they) it is neither fitting nor convenient that Chriſt ſhould have uſed ſo many figures, and ſpoken in ſuch dark terms, when he might have ſpoken plainly. We have already ſhewed that Chriſt's ordinary uſe was to ſpeak unto the *Jews* by figures and ſimilitudes, and that the *Caſernaites*, objecting unto him the bread of Heaven given by *Moſes*, gave him occaſion to ſpeak ſo. That if our adverſaries do ſo much diſlike figures, why do they ſay that from the 27 verſe of this chap. to the 51. the Lord ſpeaks of the ſpiritual manducation, and uſeth figurative words? Why will they have that when Chriſt ſaid, *Except ye drink my blood: by drinking*, he underſtandeth *eating?* That if the queſtion be touching the difficulty, is there any thing in the World harder to conceive and to believe, than this doctrine, whereby they will have Chriſt to have eaten his own fleſh, and that an human body be whole and entire in every crum of the hoſt, and be remote and divided from itſelf, and that a Prieſt ſhould make a God with a few words, and that this God muſt run the riſque and be ſubject to be eaten by Rats and Mice, and carried away by the wind?

5. Yet (ſay they) Chriſt ſaid, *My fleſh is meat indeed.* Now, this word *truly* or *indeed*, excludes all figure: For they eſteem that figurative words are not true. If it be ſo, why do they themſelves put in ſo many figures? Why will they have this word, *bread*, to be taken figuratively, and the word *drinking*, to ſignify eating? They muſt then ſay that when Chriſt in the 15 of S. *John*, 1 ver. ſaid, *I am the true Vine*, he ſpoke falſly: or elſe they muſt needs grant that this word *true*, excludes not the figure. So in the 8 to the *Heb.* 2. v. the Apoſtle calleth Paradiſe *the true* Tabernacle. It is a common thing to ſay that God is the true Sun of the Soul, and that evil examples are

truly the plague and contagion of the mind. All that in figurative terms, and yet true, and wherein the word *true* excludes not the figure.

6. What they do add, is not a whit better. Chriſt (ſay they) uſed an oath, ſaying, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* But it is not convenient (ſay they) to uſe figures in an oath. What will they ſay then to theſe places, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, that he that entreth not by the door into the ſheepfold, the ſame is a thief and a robber, John* 10. 1. And a little after, *Verily, verily I ſay unto you, that I am the door of the ſheep.* And in S. *Matth.* 18. 18. *Verily I ſay unto you, that whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven.* And *John* 3. 5. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the ſpirit, &c.* Where we have the ſame oath with figurative words. What more? The ſame verſe which they alledge, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except ye eat my fleſh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you,* is the ſame verſe in which they will have *drinking* to ſignify *eating.* And in the ſame chap. ver. 32. Chriſt calleth himſelf *the true bread:* wherein our Adverſaries do acknowledge a figure. To let paſs that the word *Amen* is not an Oath, but a ſimple and ſtrong affirmation.

CHAP. VI. *Teſtimonies of the Fathers.*

IT is good upon this point to hear the ancient Fathers. S. *Auſtin* ſhall march in the fore front. In his Book of Chriſtian Doctrine, chap. 16. ‘ * When ‘ the Lord ſaith, Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon ‘ of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in ‘ yourſelves, it ſeems that he commands ſome great

* Niſi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis, &c. facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo eſt, præcipiens paſſioni Domini eſſe communicandum, & ſuaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixae t vulnerata ſit.

‘ crime

'crime or heinous offence. It is then a figure, that 'commands to communicate unto the Lord's Paſſion; 'and ſweetly and profitably to put in remembrance 'that Chriſt's fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.' Our Adverſaries, to clear themſelves and avoid the force of this place, do make long diſcourſes, and find there are figures in theſe words, *Except ye eat, &c.* To wit that in the Euchariſt, Chriſt's body is not eaten by piece-meals as the fleſh of the Shambles. But they come not near the point. For Saint *Auſtin* ſaith not only that it is a figure, but he declares alſo how that figure is to be taken and expounded; to wit, that to eat Chriſt's fleſh, is to meditate and call to remembrance with delight, that Chriſt's fleſh was crucified for us. Which is an expoſition our adverſaries do not allow.

The ſame Father upon the 98 Pſalm. 'Underſtand 'ſpiritually what I have ſaid unto you, Ye ſhall not 'eat this body that ye ſee, and ſhall not drink that 'blood that ſhall be ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucify 'me. I have commended unto you a ſacred ſign 'which being underſtood ſpiritually, ſhall quicken and 'vivify you.'

We have in this Father a long expoſition of the ſixth Chapter of Saint *John* in the 25. 26. and 27 Treatiſes upon Saint *John:* In the 25 Tractat he ſaith, '* This '(viz. to believe) is to eat the meat that periſheth not. 'Why doſt thou make ready thy teeth and thy belly? 'Believe and thou haſt eaten.' And in the 26th 'Treatiſe, '† To believe in him, is to eat the living 'bread. He that believes in him, eateth him; he 'is fed inviſibly, becauſe he is regenerated inviſibly.' And in the ſame place, ‡ 'By this meat and drink 'Chriſt will have to be underſtood the ſociety of his

* Ut qu'd paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducaſti.

† Credere in eum, hoc eſt manducare panem vivum. Qui credit in eum manducat, inviſibiliter ſaginatur, quia et inviſibiliter renaſcitur.

‡ Hunc itaq; cibum et potum ſocietatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum ſuorum, quod eſt ſancta Eccleſia in prædeſtinatis, &c.

'body and members, which is the Church of the 'Predeſtinate.' This Father was ſo far from believing that Chriſt was eaten by the mouth of the body, that even by this meat he will have the Church to be underſtood. Whence alſo he addeth, '‡ This meat and 'drink which makes ſuch as do take it, immortal and 'incorruptible, is the fellowſhip of Saints where there 'ſhall be peace and perfect unity.'

And in the ſame place, 'That, therefore, is to eat this 'meat and to drink this drink, to dwell in Chriſt and 'to have him dwelling in us. And therefore he that 'dwelleth not in Chriſt, and in whom Chriſt dwelleth 'not, doubtleſs he eats not ſpiritually his fleſh and 'drinks not his blood, how be it that carnally and vi'ſibly he preſſeth with his teeth the ſacred ſign of 'Chriſt's body and blood.' In ſum, in three long treatiſes containing many pages, wherein this good Doctor expoundeth the ſixth Chapter of Saint *John*, there is not one word of eating by the mouth of the body the Lord's fleſh crucified for us. Which expoſition was ſo diſliked by Cardinal du *Perron*, that he ſpeaketh contemptibly of theſe Tractates of Saint *Auſtin* upon Saint *John*,* ſaying, that they be popular Sermons made before all kinds of perſons, to whom he would not declare openly the Church's belief.

Tertullian in the 37 Chapter of his book of the Reſurrection, expounding theſe words, '*The fleſh profiteth nothing*:' 'The ſenſe (ſaith he) muſt be ad'dreſſed according to the ſubject whereof he ſpeaketh.

---

‡ Hoc veraciter non præſtat niſi iſte cibus & potus qui eos à quibus ſumitur, immortales & incorruptibiles facit, i. ſocietas ipſa Sanctorum, &c.

† Hoc eſt ergo manducare illam eſcam & bibere illum potum in Chriſto manere, & illum manentem in ſe habere. Ac per hæc qui non manet in Chriſto, & in quo non manet Chriſtus, proculdubio nec manducat ſpiritualiter carnem ejus nec bibit ejus ſanguinem, licet carnaliter, & viſibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti.

* In his Book againſt the King of Great Britain. In the Treatiſe of the Euchariſt.

For

' ‖ For becauſe they eſteemed his words to be harſh ' and intolerable, as though he had determined to give ' them truly his fleſh to eat that he might render ſpi- ' ritual the ſtate of ſalvation, he ſaid before, It is the ' ſpirit that quickneth:' Then he addeth, ' The fleſh ' profiteth nothing, to wit for to vivify.'

And there again ' § The word was made fleſh, and ' by conſequent, for to have life, it muſt be deſired ' and devoured by the ear, and ruminated by the un- ' derſtanding, and digeſted by faith.'

And a little after, ' The Lord had a little before ' declared, that his fleſh is the heavenly bread *, urg- ' ing altogether by allegory taken from neceſſary ' meats, the remembrance of the Fathers.'

Clemens Alexandrinus, in his ſecond book *De Pedagogo*, chap. 6. he ſaid † ' eat my fleſh and drink my ' blood, propounding by an allegory the evidence of ' the faith, and the drink of the promiſe.'

And a little after, ‡ ' He calleth the holy Spirit ' fleſh by allegory. For the fleſh was created by him, ' and the blood ſignifies the word.'

Origen upon the *Leviticus*, in the ſeventh book: ' Know that theſe things written in the divine volumes, ' are figures and underſtand them as ſpiritual, and not ' as carnal. For if you receive them as carnal, they ' hurt you inſtead of nouriſhing you. For in the ' Goſpels, there is a letter which killeth him that

---

‖ Quia durum & intolerabilem exiſtimaverunt ſermonem ejus quaſi vere carnem ſuam illis edendam determinaſſet ut in ſpiritu diſponeret ſtatum ſalutis, præmiſit, Spiritus eſt qui vivificat. Tum addit, Caro non prodeſt quicquam; ad vivificandum ſcilicet.

§ Quia & ſermo caro erat factus, proinde in cauſam vitæ appetendus, & devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus.

* Urgens uſquequaque per allegoriam neceſſariorum pabulorum memoriam Patrum, &c.

† Φάγιτε μυ τὰς σὰρκας ειπών, καὶ πίσθὶ μυ τὸ ἅιμα ἐναργίς τῆς πιςιως καὶ τῆς παγσιλίας τὸ ποτιμὸν ἀλληγοφῶν.

‡ Σάρκα ἡμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀλληγοριῖ.

' obſerves not the things that are ſpoken ſpiritually. ' ‖For if thou takeſt according to the letter, that which ' is ſaid, Except ye eat my fleſh and drink my blood, ' that letter killeth.

The Commentary upon the Pſalms, attributed to St. *Hierom*, upon the 44 Pſalm, ' § When the Lord ſaith ' he that eateth not my fleſh, &c. though that may be ' underſtood in myſtery, yet to ſpeak more truly, the ' body and blood of Chriſt is the word of the Scrip- ' tures, and the heavenly doctrine. And a little ' after ‡‡ the fleſh and blood of Chriſt is poured into ' our ears.'

It is true, that ſome places may be found in antient Fathers, that apply and fit the words of the 6th chapter of St. *John* to the Euchariſt, becauſe the manducation of the Sacrament ſerves to help the ſpiritual manducation, and there is ſome analogy between theſe two. Add moreover, that we have proved already by a multitude of places, of antient fathers, that when they ſay that in the Euchariſt, we eat the fleſh or the body of Chriſt, they mean to ſpeak of another fleſh and another body, than that which was crucified for us, which is called Chriſt's body, becauſe of the myſtical union of the bread with Chriſt, and becauſe the ſigns take the name of the things ſignified.

Upon this, the words of Pope *Pius* the ſecond, are notable in his 130 Epiſtle; ' * Ye muſt not wonder, ' *ſaith he*, if ſome Doctors ſpeaking of the ſacramen-

---

‖ Si ſecundum literam ſequeris hoc ipſum quod dictum eſt, Niſi manducaveritis carnem meam et biberitis ſanguinem meum, hæc litera occidit.

§ Quando dicit, Qui non manducaverit carnem meam et biberit ſanguinem meum, licet in myſterio poſſit intelligi, tamen verius corpus Chriſti et ſanguis ejus ſermo Scripturarum eſt.

‡‡ Corpus et ſanguis ejus in auribus noſtris funditur.

* Sed nec moveri debetis, quod nonnulli Doctores de communione Sacramentali loquentes, illamque populo ſuadentes Johannis verba recipiunt. Neque enim propterea illius loci vel talis verus eſt et proprius intellectus, ſed ex quadam ſimilitudine conſonantique ratione, trahitur inde magis ſenſus quàm ducitur, &c.

' tal

'tal communion, and counſelling it unto the People, 'do imploy Saint *John* his words. For it doth not 'follow from thence, that it be the true and proper 'ſenſe of that place, but by ſome reſemblance and 'agreeable reaſon, this ſenſe is rather drawn than led. 'And it is lawful for the Doctors, ſpeaking after the 'manner of orators, to uſe ſometimes figures and 'tranſlations, ſo that oftentimes, ſpeaking of the ſign, 'they paſs unto the thing ſignified.

CHAP. VII. *Impiety of* Salmeron *the Jeſuit, and of* Peter Charron. *And of* Bellarmin's *four men incloſed in one ſuit of clothes. That by this doctrine Chriſt hath not a true body in the Sacrament.*

SUperſtition and Atheiſm are very near neighbours, and the one leadeth unto the other. For frantick ſuperſtition intangles the mind with extravagant conceits, that expoſe religion to laughter, and make men to think that religion is a ſhop of fables, and a meer imagination. Whence it comes to paſs, that thoſe that take upon them to defend ſuperſtition, let go very often certain words of impiety, whereby they profane the myſteries, and ſcoff at their own religion under colour of defending it.

Salmeron the Jeſuit, and Doctor *Charron* give us an example thereof. This Jeſuit in the IX tom. and 26 treatiſe, * for to repreſent the manner and the end for which Chriſt gives us his fleſh to eat, ſaith, that Chriſt hath done as men do, who for to kindle and inflame a woman with love, do give her an amorous Potion or morſel, and that juſt ſo Chriſt in the Euchariſt gives to his Church *Panis bucellam ſanctè benedictam & incantatam, a morſel of bread holily bleſſed and inchanted for to tranſport her with his love.*

Charron hath followed him, but with an addition that declares what are the ingredients of thoſe philters or

* Sub finem Tractatus.

amorous potions, to wit, that there enters in them ſomething of the ſubſtance of the lover, which ſubſtance is a thing not fit to be named. In his eighth diſcourſe of the Euchariſt, after he hath ſaid that God comes down in the form of bread and wine, and that to dance for to ſerve God, is leſs ſtrange than what is done in the Maſs; a little after, he declares, how Chriſt communicates himſelf unto men in the Euchariſt, to wit, that he allures and intices them with a dainty and delicious bit, 'Love *ſaith he*, is ſo ingenious and 'inventive, that for to win and allure the heart and 'will of others it hath found out a device to employ 'inchanted morſels, philters and amorous potions, 'and to make them to be taken and drunk by thoſe 'of whom one deſires to be loved, in which morſels 'or potions enters ſomething of the lover or ſuitor. 'Thus it ſeems that God for to draw and allure unto 'himſelf, the heart and love of the Church, would 'preſent a bit or potion made of his ſubſtance in this 'ſacrament, the philter and amorous drink of all 'Chriſtians, the dainty and delicious bit for to draw 'and allure them unto himſelf.' Doubtleſs this man jeſted and intended to make the world laugh, for he could not expect that men ſhould believe him.

I know not whether *Bellarmin* did mock or jeſt, when for to prove that a body may be in ſeveral places at once, † he ſaith that it is poſſible that four men hold no more place than one of the four alone, and that all four fill up but one place. Take me a man cloathed with a ſuit of clothes that fits cloſe and is made juſt to his body, *Bellarmin* ſaith it is poſſible for theſe four men to be contained in the ſame ſuit of clothes, without being made larger, and the men never a whit the leſs. If that be poſſible for four, it is alſo poſſible for ten, yea for a hundred, yea for a thouſand; ſo that all the men of the world ſhall be

† Bellar. lib. 3. de Euchar. cap. 7. § ad tertium poteſt fieri ut redigatur ad locum unitatis, ita ut quatuor homines occupent locum unius hominis.

contained

contained in a ſingle doublet. But if of theſe four men in this little doublet, one be ſitting and the other lying, and the other ſtanding: If one of them embrace the other, and by conſequent is out of the other, they ſhall not be in one and the ſame place. If they ſpeak together, and look one upon another, the one ſhall be the object of the other's eyes, and therefore ſhall not be in one and the ſelf ſame place. Truly I think this Jeſuit, propounding ſuch things, and ſhutting up a whole commonwealth in a doublet, had a mind to deride his own religion. For by the ſame reaſon a man may have both his eyes in one place, and not different of ſituation. By this means a man ſhall have two eyes, and ſhall have but one; and the parts of an human body ſhall not be diſtinct, and the one ſhall not be out of the other. This our adverſaries do by their tranſubſtantiation; as *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth, ſaying, ‘ ‡ that in the Euchariſt Chriſt doth not exiſt af-
‘ ter the manner of bodies, but rather after the manner
‘ of Spirits, ſince he is whole in every part.’

It is falſe likewiſe, that according to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, Chriſt's body be in the Euchariſt after the manner of Spirits. For when an Angel is preſent in any place, he is not preſent in a thouſand other ſeveral places, and is not far from himſelf and divided from himſelf, as they will have Chriſt's body to be in a million of ſeveral places at one and the ſame time.

The ſame Jeſuit in the third book and fifth chapter ſaith, ‘ ‖ that a ſubſtance without quantity cannot be
‘ termed fleſh.’ Whereupon it follows that Chriſt's body under the hoſt is not fleſh, for there is no quantity, ſince it is whole under every point that hath no quantity. Beſides that the quantity of a body is a continued quantity. But Chriſt's body in the hoſt is not one in continuity, with that which is in heaven

‡ Bellar. lib. 1. de Euchar. c. 2. § Tertia. Chriſtus in Euchariſtia non habet modum exiſtendi corporum, ſed potius ſpirituum, cum ſit totus in qualibet parte.

‖ § Ad hæc, Subſtantia ſine quantitate caro dici non poteſt.

ſitting at the right hand of God the Father, ſince he is far and remote from it.

Again, he ſaith in the ſame place, ‘ § That a body ‘ is nothing elſe than an extenſion in length, breadth, ‘ and depth.’ Therefore in the Sacrament there is no true body of Chriſt, ſince it hath no extenſion, no length, breadth and depth; as he ſaith himſelf in the ſecond chapter of his firſt book, ‘ Chriſt's body in the ‘ Euchariſt hath no extenſion.’

I have wonder'd many times, ſeeing that our adverſaries hold that Chriſt remains in the ſtomach of the Communicants until the ſpecies be deſtroyed and conſumed by the digeſtion, why they do not give them hard bread and not of eaſy digeſtion, that they might have Chriſt in them a longer time, rather than to give them ſuch light hoſts or wafers, which are preſently turned into a *Chylus* and digeſted in an inſtant.

CHAP. VIII. *Of the progreſs of this abuſe, and by what means Satan hath eſtabliſhed the Tranſubſtantiation.*

UPON this matter, the opinions of men began to vary in the eighth age, wherein the controverſy touching the adoration of images was in its height and force. For Satan at the ſame time did labour and buſy himſelf to introduce and bring into the Church theſe two ſorts of Idolatry.

In the year of our Lord 754, the Emperor *Conſtantine*, ſon to *Liſaurus*, called a Council of his whole Empire at *Conſtantinople*, where 330 Biſhops were preſent, that condemned the adoration of images. Among other reaſons that they bring, they exhort the people to be contented with thoſe images that Chriſt had inſtituted, having given in the holy ſupper the bread and wine for images and figures of his body

§ Quid eſt corpus, niſi extenſio in longitudinem, latitudinem & profunditatem?

and

and blood. And ſpeaking of the Euchariſtical bread, they ſay, ‘ * Behold the image of this quickning ‘ body that is honourably preſented,’ and a little after, ‘ The Lord commanded to ſet [*upon the table*] that ‘ image altogether choſen, to wit, the ſubſtance of ‘ the bread, leſt idolatry ſhould creep in, if it were ‘ repreſented in a human form.’

But few years after, the Empire being fallen into the hands of *Irenea*, an idolatrous woman, and who did put out the eyes of her own ſon, and raviſhed the Empire from him, this monſter called another Council at *Nice*, in the year 787, where ſhe cauſed images to be re-eſtabliſhed, and the worſhipping of them to be commanded under pain of a curſe. There likewiſe were condemned as abominable, theſe foreſaid clauſes of the former Council, whereby the bread and wine are called images of the Lord's body and blood. And it is the ſame Council that declares, that images are equivalent and of as much worth as the Goſpel; and that an image is better than prayer; and that angels are corporeal; and that he that hath the leaſt doubt whether images muſt be worſhipped, is accurſed. For certainly the ſpirit of Satan reigned in that pernicious Council. Wherefore alſo *Charles* the great, who lived then, called another council at *Frankfort*, *Anno Domini* 794, in which that council of *Nice* was condemned as erroneous, by a general conſent: notwithſtanding that Pope *Adrian* had approved that Council, and made a treatiſe in defence of it.

Whilſt Satan beſtirred himſelf thus in the Eaſt Parts, the Roman Biſhops on their ſide did labour in the Weſt parts. For they did well perceive that theſe two Things, to wit the Adoration of the Sacrament, and the Adoration of Images, would be of great Uſe, and would ſerve much for the ſtrengthening of their Empire, and encreaſing of the Dignity of the Romiſh Clergy. For the Pope taking out of the Way the Holy Scriptures from the Eyes of the People, hath given them

---

* Ecce vivificantis illius corporis Imaginem.

images,

Images, which they call ignorant Men's Books; buſying the Eyes of the People, whilſt he conveyed away the Word of God from them. And the Opinion of the real Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, exalts the Dignity and Power of Prieſts, ſo far as to be able to make God with Words, and to have Chriſt in their own Power.

This Abuſe beginning to creep in *France*, King *Charles* the *Bald*, about the Year 870, made a Commandment unto one *Bertram* a Prieſt, and as learned a Man as thoſe Times did afford, to compoſe and write a Book of this Matter: Which Book we have yet whole and extant at this Day, wherein he maintains the true doctrine, and withſtands ſtoutly and vigorouſly that Opinion of the real Preſence of the Body of Chriſt under the Species of the Bread. For of Tranſubſtantiation, there was yet no Speech of it. For which Cauſe alſo *Bellarmin* in his firſt Book of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, firſt Chap. puts this *Bertram* amongſt the Hereticks. Who, notwithſtanding in his Time, lived with honour, and was neither troubled nor received any rebuke or reprehenſion upon this ſubject. Of the ſame opinion were *John Scotus* and *Drutmarus*, and others of the ſame time. And I make no doubt but many others with them have defended the ſame cauſe in writing: But the following ages, in which error prevailed, have aboliſhed their writings, and it is marvellous how this book of *Bertram* could eſcape us.

The tenth and eleventh ages, are the ages wherein this error did ſtrengthen itſelf moſt, in which nevertheleſs God left not himſelf without teſtimony. For *Bruno* Biſhop of *Angiers*, and (after him but more vigorouſly) *Berengarius*, his arch-deacon, taught and maintained openly that the bread and wine of the Euchariſt, were not the body of Chriſt but the figure and remembrance of it *: This *Berangarius* began to ſhew himſelf about the

* Sigebert, ad annum 1051.

year

year of our Lord 1050, againſt whom Pope *Victorius* II. cauſed a Council to be gathered at *Tours*, about the year 1055, and four years after, *Nicholas* II. cited him to *Rome* to the Council aſſembled for that effect, where *Berengarius* was forced to condemn his own doctrine, and ſubmit himſelf to the Pope's will. By the reading of that Council, it appears that there were in it many others of the ſame opinion of *Berengarius*. And *Leo* † *Hoſtienſis*, recordeth, that none of thoſe that were there preſent, could reſiſt *Berengarius*. The form of the abjuration preſcribed unto him, is to be found in the collections of the *Decrees* made by *Ivo Carnutenſis*, and by *Gratian*, which form is ſet down in abſurd terms, and which the Church of *Rome* herſelf believes not. For they make him ſay ‡, that the bread is the true body of Chriſt, and that Chriſt's body is truly and ſenſibly handled and bruiſed by the teeth of the faithful. But *Berengarius* being rid out of the hands of that Council and returned back into *France*, proteſted againſt the violence offered unto him, and continued to teach the ſame doctrine till the year 1088, in which he died. Upon his tomb, *Hildebertus* ‖, who after was biſhop of *Mans*, made an honourable Epitaph, wherein he terms him, 'the 'prop and ſupport of the Church, the hope and the 'glory of the Clergy.' And *France*, *Germany*, *Italy* and *England*, were full of people that embraced his doctrine, as *William* of *Malmeſbury* teſtifies in the third book of his *Engliſh* hiſtory, 'all *France* ſaith he, was 'full of his doctrine; and *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter*, 'in the year 1087, § *Berengarius* of *Tours*, being

† Leo Hoſtienſis Chro. Caſſinenſi lib. 3. c. 35. Eique cum nullus valeret reſiſtere, Albericus idem evocatur.

‡ Can. Ego Berengar. Diſt. 2. de Conſecr.

‖ Hild. Epitaphio Berengar. apud Malmeſburienſem. Quem modo miratur ſemper mirabiliter orbis. Ille Berengarius non obiturus obit. Quem ſacræ fidei faſtigia ſumma tenentem, &c. Vide Baron. ad ann. 1088. § 21.

§ Eodem tempore Berengarius Turonenſis in hæreticam lapſus pravitatem, omnes Gallos, Italos, Anglos, ſuis jam pene corrupetat pravitatibus.

'fallen

'fallen into hereſy, had corrupted by his depravations almoſt all the *French*, *Italians* and *Engliſh*.'

Platina in the life of *John* XV. ſpeaks thus of *Berengarius*, 'it is certain that *Odius*, biſhop of *Clugni*, 'and *Berengarius* of *Tours*, men famous and renowned for doctrine and holineſs, were in great eſteem in 'that time.' Add to this, that *Berengarius* diſtributed all his means to the poor, and betook himſelf to get his living with the labour of his hands. * *Antoninus* Arch-biſhop of *Florence*, whom the Pope hath canonized and made a Saint, give him, this teſtimony in the ſecond tom. of his chronicles. tit. 16. § 20. 'This *Berengarius* was otherwiſe a good man, full of 'alms deeds, and humility, and having great poſſeſſions and riches, which he diſtributed to the poor, 'and would have no woman to come before his 'eyes.'

About the latter end of *Berengarius*'s life, lived *Gregory* VII. who entered into the Papacy in the year of our Lord 1073, called *Hilderbrand*, before he was Pope. This *Gregory* was ſuſpected to incline to *Berengarius*'s opinion. *Sigonius* in his ninth book of the reign of *Italy*, in the year 1080, recordeth, that the Biſhops of *Germany*, aſſembled at *Brixina*, in *Bavaria*, did call this *Gregory Veterem hæretici Berengarii diſcipulum*, an old diſciple of *Berengarius* the heretick, accuſing him of calling into queſtion the Apoſtolick faith, touching the body and blood of the Lord. And this agrees with cardinal *Benno*, Arch-prieſt of the Cardinals who was very inward and familiar with the ſaid *Gregory*, and who wrote his life, wherein he ſaith that *Gregory* appointed a faſt to three Cardinals, to the end God might ſhew whether of the two, to wit, *Berengarius* or the Church of *Rome*, had the righteſt opinion. And there he relates, that *John*, biſhop of *Port*, in a ſermon at St. *Peter*'s church, did declare in pre-

* Fuit alias Berengarius iſte vir bonus, plenus eleemoſynis, et humilitate, magnarum poſſeſſionum, qui omnia in uſus pauperum diſperſit, &c.

ſence

ſence both of clergy and people, that *Gregory*, for to obtain ſome divine anſwer, had in the preſence of the Cardinals caſt the holy Sacrament into the fire.

Berengarius being dead, he had many ſucceſſors that maintained the ſame doctrine even to the time of *Petrus de Valdo*, of the city of *Lions*, whoſe diſciples were named by their enemies, *Valdenſes* and *Albigenſes*: Of whoſe Religion and Confeſſion of Faith, conformable to ours, hath been ſpoken before in the 21 Chapter of the firſt Book, and ſhewed that their Churches remain, even unto our times.

Furthermore, *John Wicklif* in *England*, * in the year 1390, taught the ſame. Of whoſe doctrine contained in eighteen Articles, here is the firſt. 'That 'the ſubſtance of the bread remains after the Conſe-'cration, and ceaſes not to be bread.'

Againſt the Faithful that profeſſed this doctrine, the Pope ſtirred up Kings and Princes, and cauſed an incredible butchery to be made of them, preaching the *Croiſadoe* againſt them, whereby he gave the ſame ſpiritual graces unto thoſe that ſhould maſſacre them, as to thoſe that went into *Syria* againſt the *Saracens*, for to reconquer Chriſt's Sepulcher, to whom he gave the remiſſion of all their ſins, and a degree of glory above the ordinary, as may be ſeen in the Bull of *Innocent* the third, placed at the end of the Council of *Lateran*. The Earl of *Montfort*, having with him one *Dominick*, author of the Order of the *Jacobins*, with an army of theſe croſſed ones, did maſſacre in a few months above two hundred thouſand of them.

And for to ſtrengthen and fortify this abuſe, there was no ſpeech in thoſe times but of miracles, coined of purpoſe, tending to the worſhip of Images, and eſtabliſhing of the real preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt. They gave out to the people that ſuch an Image had ſweated blood, that another had nodded his head. That a wooden Crucifix prickt in the ſide

---

* Faſciculus rerum expetendarum fol. 95. Iodocus Coccius Tom. II. lib. 6. de Euchar. fol. 692.

had

had caſt blood. † That to an Image of the Virgin *Mary*, brought from *Damaſcus*, breaſts of fleſh were grown upon the wood. That in ſuch a place the Hoſt had appeared in the form of a child, and an Angel by it, that did hack him to pieces. That an Hoſt, pricked by a Jew, had guſhed out blood: And being caſt into a great cauldron or kettle, was turned into a man, as is to be ſeen yet at this day in *Paris* repreſented upon the forefront or porch of the Church of the *Billetes*. The life of St. *Anthony* of *Padua* ſaith, that he preſented the conſecrated Hoſt to an Aſs, which preſently left eating of his Oats and worſhipped the Hoſt. ‖ *Wedekindus* a Saxon Prince ſaw a child thruſt into the mouth of the Communicants. § An Angel did preſent Chriſt in the Maſs unto a Prieſt called *Plegils*, in the ſhape or form of a child, which he kiſſed and embraced with great courage. ‡ A little Jewiſh boy coming by chance into the Church as he was playing, ſaw upon the Altar a little boy that was minced and cut into ſmall pieces, and thruſt by ſmall lumps into the mouths of the Communicants. *Thomas Cantipratenſis* in his ſecond Book of Miracles, Chapter 40, ſaith, that at *Doway*, in the year 1260, the conſecrated Hoſt being fallen to the ground, riſed up again of it ſelf, and perched it ſelf upon the cloath wherewith the Prieſt did wipe his hands, in the ſhape or form of a fine little boy, who inſtantly became a tall man, having a crown of thorns upon his head, and two drops of blood running down from his forehead on both ſides of his noſe. * *Jodocus Coccius* collect about one hundred of ſuch miracles. For in *Berengarius* his time ſuch miracles were very rife and frequent. *Matthew Paris* an Engliſh Hiſtorian, in the year of our Lord, 1247, relates that the *Templers* of

---

† This fable is recited by Fulgoſ. lib. 1. c. 6. And by Naucelerus Gener. 44.

‖ Albertus Krantzius Metropol. lib. 1. ca. 9.

§ Paſchaſius Ratbertus de corpore & ſanguine Domini c. 14.

‡ Guil. Malmesbur. l. 3. cap. 27.

* Jodocus Coccius Theſaur. Tom. II. lib. 6. de Euchariſtia.

the

the holy land ſent to *Henry* the third King of England, a little Chryſtal bottle full of the true blood of our Saviour Chriſt, that he ſhed upon the Croſs, which Chryſtal bottle that filly King carried upon his noſe to Weſtminſter Church in Proceſſion a foot, cloathed with an old ſleeveleſs gown. *Salmeron* the Jeſuit in the XI. Tome and fifth Treatiſe, page 35, ſaith, that at *Rome* in the Church of *Lateran*, there is ſome of Chriſt's blood kept. *Item*, In the Church of St. *Maximin* at *Rome*, which *Mary Magdalen* gathered up at the foot of the Croſs. There was alſo at *Rochel* ſome kept, as the ſaid Jeſuit ſaith in the ſame place.

Sigonius, in his fourth Book of the reign of *Italy*, † ſaith, that in the year 804, was brought out of *Syria* to *Mantua*, a portion of the blood that ran out of the Image of a Crucifix, which did many miracles. And that the fame of it being come to *Charles* the *Great*, he intreated by letters Pope *Leo*, to enquire of the truth of the matter: And that the ſaid Pope having known and perceived the truth of the thing, wrote to *Charlemaine* touching the ſame. And in the eighth Book, in the year 1048, he ſaith, that the inhabitants of *Mantua* having forgotten this blood, and knowing no more what it was, this blood began again to do miracles. *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit upon the 76 queſtion of the third Part of *Thomas*, ‖ ſaith, that yet at this day there is in *Spain* ſome of Chriſt's blood kept in Reliques.

Thus the darkneſs grew thick, and the myſtery of iniquity ſtrengthened it ſelf daily more and more, the kings having no knowledge at all of the holy Scripture, and trembling under the Popes thunderbolts and excommunications, and pouring abundance of

---

† Porte ſanguinis ex imagine crucifixi Salvatoris in Syria effuſi portio delata Mantuam fuerat, &c. Carolus Leonem Pontificem per literas obſecravit ut accurate horum miraculorum veritatem vellet explorare & compertam ſibi ſignificare. Ob id Leo Roma egreſſus Mantuam venit, & re cognita, ad Carolum ſcripſit.

‖ Art. 8.

wealth

wealth and riches into the boſom of the Clergy for the eaſing of their ſouls after death.

And for a full meaſure of miſchief, new Orders of Mendicant Fryers did ſpring up, namely the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans*, whereof *Francis Aſſiſias* in *Italy*, and *Dominick Calarogenſis* in *Spain* were the firſt Founders, in the year of our Lord, 1216, and 1223. An incredible multitude of theſe Monks were dilated and ſpread over all the regions of the Pope's Empire, who made uſe of them as of ſo many torches and trumpets for to provoke and encourage Princes to the perſecution of the faithful. And it was the ſaid Monks that have coined and forged the School Divinity, all briſtled with pricks, and twiſted about with ſubtilties, much like unto the Cray-fiſh in which there is much picking, but little to eat. It is from this Divinity that ſubtle diſtinctions are drawn, wherewith they cover themſelves againſt the truth. *Ariſtotle* is alledged there a great deal oftner than the Apoſtle St. *Paul*. Thus it behoved the myſtery of iniquity ſhould advance it ſelf.

At the birth of theſe begging Fryers, *Innocent* the third, in the year 1215, called a Council at *Rome* in the *Lateran* Church, in which the word of Tranſubſtantiation, not as yet received by any definition in the Roman Church, was eſtabliſhed by an expreſs Canon, and authority of Council.

CHAP. IX. *Of the Judgment which the Doctors of the Roman Church do make touching the apparitions, whereby a little Child, or a morſel of fleſh hath appeared at the Maſs in the hands of the Prieſt, and touching Chriſt's blood that is kept in Reliques.*

ALONG time hath been that if one had doubted that a child, or a piece of fleſh that had appeared in a Prieſt's hand, were not truly Chriſt, and that Chriſt's blood that was kept in reliques, was not truly his blood, it would have been

been an hereſy deſerving the fire, and a manifeſt impiety. The People did flock together for to worſhip this blood. Therefore *Guitmondus* in his third book of the Sacrament, and *Paſchaſius* in his Book of the body and blood of the Lord, Chapter 14, and *Iodocus Coccius* in his Collection of the places of the Fathers, and many others, do make uſe of theſe miraculous apparitions, for to prove Chriſt's real preſence in the Euchariſt.

Thomas Aquinas ‡ in the third part of his Summe, queſtion, 76. Art. 8. finds himſelf mightily peſtered upon this point: For though he teacheth that that which appeareth thus miraculouſly, ought to be worſhipped with the adoration of *Latria*, as Chriſt, and that Chriſt is there preſent; yet withal he eſteems that ſometimes theſe apparitions are not true, but only in appearance, eſpecially when the ſame thing appears but to ſome and not to all. For which cauſe, *Cajetan* in his Annotations upon this place of *Aquinas*, departs from his opinion touching the Adoration, * and will have this blood or fleſh that appears ſometimes in the Maſs, to be worſhipped, not as Chriſt; but as Chriſt's garment, which is an inferior adoration.

But the Jeſuit *Vaſquez* goes more plainly to work, in his 193 Diſput. here be his words. † 'I anſwer 'that that which appears, is not the fleſh of Chriſt, 'nor of any other that be truly fleſh, but that it is only 'an effigy or appearance of fleſh, as St. *Thomas* ſaith.

---

‡ Thom. 3. part. q. 76. Art. 8. Tali apparitione facta eadem reverentia exhibetur et, quod apparet, quæ etiam primo exhibebatur; quod quidem non fieret ſi vere non eſſet ibi Chriſtus cum reverentiam latriæ exhibemus.

* Cajetan, in Notis. Si quæratur qua adoratione venerandus eſſet hujuſmodi ſanguis miraculoſus: Dicendum idem eſſe judicium de ipſo & de veſte Chriſti.

† Vaſquez in 76. q. tertiæ par. Thomæ artic. 8. Diſp. 193. cap. 2. Reſpondeo neque apparere carnem Chriſti, neque ulterius, quæ re vera caro ſit, ſed carnis ſolum effigiem, ut dixit S. Thomas, &c. Quod ad ſimplices, decipiantur et credant ibi eſſe carnem Chriſti diviſibili et cruento modo, parum refert: hæc enim deceptio inſtructione vera Doctorum corrigenda eſt.

'And

'And as touching the ſimple that are deceived, and 'believe that Chriſt's fleſh is there in a manner diviſible and bloody, it matters not much. For that de-'ception ought to be corrected by the true inſtruction 'of the Doctors.'

Gabriel Biel, a famous Doctor, in his 51 Leſſon upon the Canon of the † Maſs, goes further, and ſaith, 'that ſuch apparitions of fleſh and blood may 'be done by illuſion of the devil for to deceive the 'ſimple, God permitting it thus.' And he brings an example of it: To wit, that in the Country of *Thuringe* in the City of *Yſennac* in a Convent of *Minorite Fryers*, ‡ a certain man in the likeneſs of an Angel appeared to a Lay Brother preparing himſelf to the communion, who chopt into his mouth a piece of fleſh, which ſo ſoon as he had ſwallowed, he was poſſeſt and grievouſly tormented by the devil.

And truly, thoſe that eſteem that Chriſt appeareth truly upon the Altar in the form of a child or of a piece of fleſh, and worſhip it, are very much puzzled. For the *Roman* Church doth acknowledge but two ſorts of Chriſt's real preſence, the one natural and viſible after which he converſed with his Diſciples here on earth: The other Sacramental all under the accidents of bread. But when theſe things do appear (yea if ever they do appear) Chriſt is neither preſent in the one, nor in the other manner. For he appears neither under his own proper accidents, nor under the accidents of the bread. And it ſhall behoove one to believe that Chriſt is a child upon the Altar: Or that a perfect man is under the accidents of a child. That if it be only a piece of fleſh, we aſk whether this piece of fleſh be whole Chriſt: Or if it be but a

---

† Poteſt fieri divina permiſſione illuſione dæmonis ad decipiendum incautos.

‡ Apparuit quidam in ſpecie Angeli particulam apparenter porrigens, Apparuit ſtultus ora ſumens de manu porrigentis apparentem hoſtiæ particulam: et continuo à diabolo obſeſſus eſt et graviter vexatus.

part

part of his body, whether this portion or piece of fleſh was taken out of the Arm or out of the Leg.

Theſe things ſerve to make us to know how powerful the ſeduction of Satan hath been, and with how much horrible darkneſs he did envelope men in the ages wherein this monſter of Tranſubſtantiation was formed. This latter age hath been aſhamed of it: for now we ſee no more the people run to *Mantua*, or to the *Billettes* Church at *Paris* for to worſhip the fleſh and the blood of Chriſt that are there kept in reliques. The French Pilgrims paſſing by *Mantua* for to go to *Rome*, ſtay there no more. They paſs the *Pyrenean* Mountains for to viſit the ſuppoſed reliques of Saint *James*: but do not go into thoſe places of *Spain* where Chriſt's blood is kept. That blood of Chriſt ſent from *Syria* to King *Henry* the third of *England*, whereof I have ſpoken in the former Chapter, that putrified in a few days, loſt inſtantly its credit, and there was no more ſpeech of it.

CHAP. X. *Of the corruption of the Papal See in the Ages wherein this error was moſt advanced.*

IN the Eighth and Ninth Ages, were caſt the firſt foundations of Tranſubſtantiation; nevertheleſs it was not yet then eſtabliſhed by Laws: and I cannot find that ever any man was moleſted for that ſubject. But in the Tenth and Eleventh Ages, the Popes laboured to hatch that monſter, and to eſtabliſh it with Authority. But God branded theſe two ages with infamous blemiſhes and diſgraces. For as vices agree well with errors, the Popes of thoſe times led ſuch an infamous life, that hardly the like is to be found in all Pagan hiſtories, and that Chair was filled with horrible confuſions.

Since Pope *Formoſus* who in the year 890. attained to the Popedom by violating the oath he had taken never to accept of it, and whoſe dead body was dragged ignominiouſly up and down the City of *Rome* and caſt into the *Tiber* by his Succeſſors: for the ſpace of a hundred and fifty years, yea of two hundred years,

we ſee nothing in hiſtories but of Popes murtherers, Popes Adulterers, necromantical Popes, perjured Popes, Popes intruded by force or by money; creatures of the Earls of *Toſcane*, that were then powerful in *Italy*, and of the harlot *Theodora* and of her daughters *Marozia* and *Theodora*, that reigned a long time in *Rome*, and made and unmade Popes at their pleaſure.

Of which time the Carmelite *Frier*, Author of *Faſciculus Temporum*, makes this lamentation: ' § Alas, ' Alas, Alas, Lord God, how is the gold obſcured and ' its good colour changed? O moſt wicked time in ' which the holy one is fallen away, and truth dimi- ' niſhed among the ſons of men.' And Cardinal *Baronius* after a long recital of the villanies of the Papal See in thoſe times, he pours out theſe complaints, ' † What was then the face of the *Roman* Church and ' how foul, when moſt powerful and moſt filthy whores ' ruled and governed in *Rome*, by whoſe will the Sees ' were changed, and Biſhopricks given away! And ' that which is horrible and not to be related, their ' Lovers, falſe Popes, were thruſt in violently in *Pe-* ' *ter*'s Chair.' And *Genebrard*, a great worſhipper of Popes, ſpeaks of the ſame time, in the year 901. of his Chronicle, in theſe terms: ' In that alone this age ' was unfortunate, that for the ſpace almoſt of one ' hundred and fifty years, about fifty Popes have ' wholly fallen away from the virtue of their prede- ' ceſſors, being rather Apotactical or Apoſtatical, than ' Apoſtolical.' *Sigonius* puts two hundred years in.

In the year of our Lord 931. *John* the eleventh, came to the Popedom. He was Baſtard to Pope *Sergius* begotten on the body of the whore *Marozia*. Whereupon *Baronius* ſaith, ' The Roman Church ſuf-

---

§ Heu, heu, heu, Dominus Deus, quomodo obſcuratum eſt aurum, mutatus eſt color optimus? O tempus peſſimum! in quo defecit ſanctus, et diminutæ ſunt veritates à filiis hominum.

† Beron. An. 912. §. 8. Quæ tunc facies Eccleſiæ Romanæ? quam fœdiſſima? cum Romæ dominarentur potentiſſimæ ac ſordidiſſimæ meretrices, quarum arbitrio mutarentur ſedes, &c. et intruderentur in ſedem Petri earum amaſii Pſeudopontifices.

' fered

'fered herſelf to be ſo villanouſly oppreſſed by ſuch a 'monſter.'

After him, there were many Popes that were creatures of the forenamed whores, even to *John* the XII. who in the year of our Lord 955. attained to the Papacy at eighteen years old, whom *Baronius* abhorres as an execrable monſter. * *Luitprandus* and *Faſciculus Temporum*, ſay, that this *John* being in bed with ſome bodies wife, was ſo beaten by the Devil that he died of it. This Pope made Children Biſhops, drank to the Devil, when he played at dice he invocated *Jupiter* and *Venus*, and conferred the ſacred Orders in a ſtable.

Then, many Popes did play at, thruſt out, and cruelly perſecuted one another, the Papacy was expoſed to ſale, and vices were there up to the roof. *France*, though in an age full of darkneſs, was moved with it, and called a Council at *Rheims* under the reign of *Hugh Capet*, whoſe Acts we have extant. In that Council, *Arnulphus* Biſhop of *Orleans*, who preſided there, ſpeaks thus: § 'O lamentable Rome, which in 'the time of our Anceſtors haſt brought forth bright 'ſhining lights, but now haſt powered out ſuch mon-'ſtrous darkneſs, that ſhall be infamous to future ages!' And a little after, 'What think ye, Reverend Fa-'thers, that the Pope is ſitting upon a high throne, 'glittering in a robe of ſcarlet and gold? If he hath 'no charity, if he do exalt himſelf being puffed up 'with ſcience alone, he is the Antichriſt ſitting on 'God's throne.' Then he adds, 'that the City of 'Rome is expoſed to ſale, and that Antichriſt is near, 'and that the myſtery of iniquity goes forward.

---

* Luitprand. lib. 6. cap. 11. Sigeber. ad annum 963. Antoninus Chroni. Tomo 11. Tract. 16. §. 16.

§ O lugenda Roma quæ noſtris majoribus clara patrum lumina protuliſti, noſtris temporibus monſtroſas tenebras futuris ſæculis famoſas effudiſti. Quid hunc Reverendi Patres in ſublimi ſolio reſidentem, veſte purpurea & aurea radiantem, quid hunc eſſe cenſetis? Nimirum ſi charitate deſtituitur, ſolaque ſcientia inflatur & extollitur, Antichriſtus eſt in ſolio Dei reſidens, &c.

In

In the year 984, * as *Sigonius* relates in the beginning of his ſeventh book of the reign of *Italy*, *Bonifacius*, who made himſelf to be called *John* the XV. having put to death two Popes, uſurped the Papacy by violence and by money. *Baronius* calls him a thief and a robber, and that had not one hair of a true Biſhop. *Genebrard*, in the year 1007, ſpeaks thus of all the Popes of that time. 'The Popes, *ſaith he*, 'of this time, being intruded by the Emperors rather 'than elected, were monſters. Thus the lawful ſucceſſion hath been troubled, as of old under the ſynagogue in the time of the kings *Antiochi*.

In the year 1033, *Benedict* IX. being but ten years old, was created Pope by the faction of his father the Count of *Tuſcula*. *Petrus Damianus* in his epiſtle to *Nicholas* the ſecond, and *Platina*, and *Faſciculus Temporum*, and *Baronius*, deſcribe this Pope like a monſter. Then three Popes held the Papacy, of whom *Platina* ſpeaks thus, '*Henry* II. being entered into '*Italy* with a mighty army, and having called a 'Council, conſtrained *Benedict* the ninth, *Sylveſter* the 'third, and *Gregory* the ſixth, as three horrible monſters 'to forſake the magiſtrature. That was done in the year of our Lord 1044, when the contention touching the converſion of the bread into the body of the Lord was in its ſtrength, and *Berengarius* in great credit in *France*, and in the neighbouring countries for his learning and good life.

The diſcreet reader and lover of the truth, ſhall weigh and ponder theſe things in his mind, and ſay in himſelf, is it credible that God would have uſed ſuch wicked inſtruments for to defend his heavenly truth? Could any good thing ſpring from ſuch wicked Popes? Are not thoſe ſuch ages as Satan deſireth for to bring

---

* In Baronius it is the year 985.

† Platina in Gregor. 6. Henricus II. in Italiam cum magno exercitu veniens, habita Synodo, cum Benedictum IX Sylveſtrum III. Gregorium VI. tanquam tria teterrima monſtra ſe abdicare magiſtratu coegiſſet,

forth

forth monſters in, and in the midſt of ſo thick a darkneſs to bring in idolatry?

CHAP. XI. *Of the oppreſſion of* England. *How Religion paſſed out of* England *into* Bohemia. *Of* Wicklif, John Huz, *and* Hierom *of* Prague. *Of the Council of* Conſtance. *Of* Ziſca *and* Procopius, *and of their victories.*

I Hope the Reader ſhall not diſlike to take here a ſhort view of the hiſtory of the troubles which happened in *Bohemia*, about religion, a little before God made the light of his Goſpel to ſhine again in *France*, *England*, *Germany*, *Switzerland* and the *Low Countries*. For in it may be ſeen a lively image of Satan, and of the power of God.

Of all countries ſubject to the Papal Empire, ‡ *England* ſuffered the hardeſt and moſt ſhameful ſervitude. That ſlavery increaſed eſpecially under the reign of *Henry* II. and of *John* and *Henry* III. In the year 1171. King *Henry* II, for to expiate the crime whereof he was accuſed, namely, to have cauſed the murther of *Thomas* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, was whip'd upon his naked fleſh by a multitude of monks, ſome giving him three ſtripes, and ſome five. With the like effeminateneſs that King yielded up to the Pope the inveſtures of benefices, which the kings his predeceſſors had poſſeſſed till that time.

That King being dead in the year 1189, had for ſucceſſor *Richard* his ſon, and after him *John*, a King bruti ſh and furious, who made ſome attempts to recover the inveſtures which his father had yielded up to the Pope. But being hated and contemned of his ſubjects, Pope *Innocent* the third had a fair way to handle him ill. He did declare him to have loſt the right of his kingdom, diſpenſed his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, a thing never ſeen nor heard of before in *England*, cauſed divine ſervice to ceaſe throughout all

‡ Math. Paris in Henrico I. An. 1171.

the kingdom, and churches and church-yards to be ſhut up, which continued by the ſpace of ſix years and a half. He alſo excommunicated the King, and gave the kingdom of *England* to *Philip Auguſtus*, King of *France*, upon condition to conquer the ſame at his own peril and fortune, and that for the remiſſion of his own ſins.

That conſtrained King *John* to yield up his kingdom to the Pope, and to bind himſelf to do homage unto him for his crown. So he made himſelf the Pope's vaſſal, and *England* became St. *Peter*'s patrimony; and a patent with a golden ſeal was made and framed, by which the King did oblige himſelf and his ſucceſſors for ever, to pay yearly unto the Pope a thouſand marks in gold, in ſign of ſubjection, beſides St. *Peter*'s monies that were paid by poll. Unto which that poor King was forced to add an oath, whereby he ſwore that he was induced ſo to do without conſtraint and of his own accord, and by the motion of the holy Spirit, and that for the remiſſion of his ſins.

Under this ſlavery died this King in the year of our Lord 1216, to whom ſucceeded *Henry* III. who did put his crown at the legate's feet, one knee upon the ground, doing homage unto him for his kingdom.

Then did the Pope begin to ſend his Legates, who ſkimmed *England* of money by a thouſand kinds of devices. The orders of the *Franciſcans* and *Jacobins* were newly inſtituted. The ſame Friars preached the Croiſado, whereby the Pope promiſed the remiſſion of all ſins, and a degree of glory in heaven above the common ſort, to all thoſe which being armed, would make the vow to go to the Holy Land for the recovering of Chriſt's ſepulchre, poſſeſſed by the *Saracens*. At theſe predications every one croſſed himſelf with a croſs upon the ſhoulder, and a great multitude of gentry and people ſold and mortgaged their lands and eſtates for the charges of that journey. But as they were armed and furniſhed for the journey, another legate would come that diſpenſed the *Engliſh* from their vow, and gave them the ſame graces and indulgences

dulgences without budging from their own houſes, provided they would give to the Pope as much money as was neceſſary to have been ſpent in their journey. By theſe means this Legate gathered huge ſums of money, and that money was employed by the Pope for to conquer the cities and provinces which the Emperor had in *Italy*. Thus did the Pope enlarge his limits.

Never a year came over head, but hungry *Italians* came over into *England*, with new commiſſions to raiſe monies, with power to excommunicate all ſuch as would refuſe, and put the churches into interdict; what good horſes ſoever there were, or curious houſhold ſtuff, or fine wares in ſhops, were conveyed away without paying for, and carried into *Italy*. The exactors took up the tithes of the corn yet unſown; the *Italians* poſſeſſed in *England* the beſt benefices; the Pope called *England* his garden of pleaſure, and his bottomleſs treaſure. Whereupon great clamours aroſe among the people; the Nobles ſaid,* 'theſe 'are the ſucceſſors of *Conſtantine*, and not of *Peter*. 'O ſhameful thing! raſcally ruffians, that know not 'what arms and honour is, will domineer over all 'the world by their excommunications.' The Monks in the country did ſay, † 'the daughter of *Sion* is be-'come a brazen fac'd whore, and without ſhame at 'all, through the juſt judgment of him, who be-'cauſe of the ſins of the people makes an hypocrite 'reign, and a tyrant to govern and rule.' But all theſe clamours were unprofitable and without effect, becauſe the holy Scripture was a book then altogether unknown amongſt the *Engliſh* people. They ſpeak of nothing but of miracles, and of images, and of pilgrimages, and of reliques, until ſuch time as an *Engliſh* doctor and preacher named *John Wiklif*, fell to preaching and writing openly againſt the Pope, and againſt the Maſs, about the year of our Lord 1370.

* Math. Paris, pag. 267. Marxidiribaldi.

† Math. Paris, pag. 423.

he was liſtened unto with great applauſe, and was able to have cauſed a great alteration in *England*, if the King would have given way to it. Of this oppreſſion in *England*, *Matthew Paris* and *Weſtmonaſterienſis*, *Engliſh* Monks that lived in thoſe days, wrote ſtrange and prodigious things.

Now as *John Wicklif* was a teaching, it fell out that a *Bohemian* gentleman, who was a ſtudent of *Oxford*, did taſte and reliſh *Wicklif*'s doctrine, and copied out his books, which he carried over into his own country, and imparted them to *John Huz*, a famous preacher, to whom *Wenceſlaus* King of *Bohemia*, brother to *Sigiſmond* Emperor, had committed the government of the ſchool of *Prague*, renowned at that time.

This *John Huz*, overcome by the evidence of *Wicklif*'s reaſons, fell a preaching his doctrine, and being a vehement and perſwaſive man, he drew after him a great number of people, to whom *Hierom* of *Prague* did adjoin himſelf, who ſurpaſſed *John Huz* in eloquence and learning. There came alſo out of *Germany* one *Petrus Dreſdenſis* and one *Jacobellus* that ſpoke with vehemency againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and againſt the communion under the only ſpecies of the bread.

For to appeaſe theſe ſtirs and commotions, the Archbiſhop of *Prague*, called *Subincō Cepus*, cauſed *Wicklif*'s books publickly to be burned, and drove out *John Huz* from *Prague*: But ſeeing the number of thoſe that he called hereticks did encreaſe daily, he himſelf fled into *Hungary*, towards *Sigiſmond*, and *John Huz* returned back to *Prague*.

Then *Benedict* the thirteenth, and *Gregory* the twelfth, excommunicated one another, the one having his ſeat at *Avignon*, and the other at *Rome*. A council was kept at *Piſa* in the year 1409, in which they created a third Pope, to wit, *Alexander* the fifth, who dying ſhortly after, *John* XXIII, ſucceeded him. So there was then three Popes all at once, and there was no body in

---

‡ Æneæ Sylvii Hiſt Bohem. all

all the Church of *Rome* but was excommunicated by ſome one of theſe Popes.

This *John* had war againſt *Ladiſlaus* King of *Naples*, and for to ſtrengthen and fortify himſelf againſt him, he ſent preachers abroad over all the countries of his obedience to preach the croiſadoe, whereby he promiſed the forgiveneſs of all ſins to all thoſe that would take up arms againſt *Ladiſlaus* for the defence of the Church.

This indulgence being publiſhed at *Prague*, many of the people began to ſay aloud and openly, that it was indeed the language of Antichriſt, that promiſed ſalvation to thoſe that ſhould ſpill the chriſtian blood. At which the Magiſtrate of *Prague* being angry, he laid hands on ſome of them and clapped them up into priſon. But the people gathered themſelves together and demanded of the magiſtrate the releaſe of theſe priſoners, who fearing an uproar, appeaſed the people with mild words, promiſing that no harm or wrong ſhould be done unto them. But ſo ſoon as this multitude was ſeparated, the magiſtrate cauſed theſe priſoners to be ſtabbed with a dagger or poinard in the priſon: So that the blood ran out in ſuch abundance that it ſtreamed into the very ſtreet. At the ſight of that blood the people being provoked to wrath and fury, they cauſed the priſon doors to be opened unto them, and conveyed away the dead corpſes, and carried them from church to church, crying aloud, 'theſe are the faithful ones, that have expoſed their 'bodies for the covenant of God.' The King did 'conſider theſe things without being much moved 'at it.

But the Emperor *Sigiſmond* deſiring to remedy the diſorders of the Papacy, and by the ſame means to pacify the troubles of *Bohemia*, did in ſuch ſort by his going and coming and beſtirring himſelf too and fro, that a Council was called and kept at *Conſtance*, a city of *Suaube* in *Germany*, in the year 1414, wherein the three forenamed Popes were degraded, eſpecially *John*

XXIII. for having (among other things laid to his charge) * maintained openly and obſtinately that the ſouls of men die as the ſouls of beaſts, and that there is neither heaven nor hell.

In theſe three Popes room was choſen in the Council *Martin* the fifth, to whom the Emperor *Sigiſmond* kneeled down before the whole council, kiſſed his feet, and worſhipped him. This *Martin* ſent ſome ambaſſadors to *Conſtantinople*, to whom he gave inſtructions that begin thus ' † the moſt holy and moſt ' bleſſed, who hath the heavenly empire, who is Lord ' on earth, ſucceſſor of Saint *Peter*, the Chriſt of the ' Lord, the Maſter of the univerſal world, the Father ' of Kings, the Light of the World, the moſt high and ' ſovereign Biſhop, *Martin* by the divine providence, ' commandeth unto maſter *Anthony Maſſon*, &c. Theſe inſtructions are inſerted in the council of *Siena*, held a little after, printed at *Paris* in the year 1612.

At the ſame council of *Conſtance* *John Huz* and *Hierom* of *Prague* were called for to confer of their doctrine; they ſhewed ſome unwillingneſs to meet thither, fearing ſome ill uſage, but the Emperor aſſured them, and gave them by the advice of the council, a large ſafe conduct, whereby he did promiſe they ſhould receive no harm there, but might with all liberty and freedom propound their reaſons, and after that return home in all ſafety.

Grounded upon the Emperor's faith and promiſe, they reſorted to the council and propounded their reaſons. They ſpoke chiefly of the communion under both kinds, but the Fathers of the council, perceiving they would not yield to that which was enjoined unto them, concluded that they ſhould be burned alive. The Emperor made ſome difficulty in it, ſaying he had obliged his faith unto them, and that they

---

* Council. Conſtant. Seſſ. XI.

† Sanctiſſimus et beatiſſimus, qui habet cœleſte arbitrium, qui eſt Dominus in terris, ſucceſſor Petri, Chriſtus Domini, Dominus univerſi, Regum pater, orbis numen, &c.

came

came under his promiſe. Thereupon that the Emperor's conſcience might be at quiet, ‖ the Council framed a canon, wherein is declared and defined, that faith muſt not be kept unto hereticks, after men have done what they can for to convert them; and that a Prince is not bound to keep what he hath promiſed them. This ſentence being pronounced to *John Huz*, he appealed to Chriſt Jeſus.

They were then executed publickly, and *Æneas Sylvius*, who afterwards was Pope, and made himſelf to be called *Pius* the ſecond, ſpeaks thus of them in the 36th chapter of his hiſtory of *Bohemia*, '§ both 'of them ſuffered death with a conſtant courage, and 'made haſte to go to the fire, as if they had been in-'vited to a feaſt, without hearing any word come 'from them that ſhewed or teſtified any ſorrowfulneſs 'of mind. When they began to burn, they fell a 'ſinging of an hymn, which could hardly be hindred 'by the violence and noiſe of the flames. No philoſo-'pher ever ſuffered death with ſuch magnanimity as 'theſe endured burning.' Then he alledgeth an epiſtle of *Poggius*, a *Florentine*, that deſcribeth the death of *Hierom* of *Prague*, who was put to death ſome days after *John Huz*. In that epiſtle *Poggius* ſpeaks as one that was preſent at the examination and death of the ſaid *Hierom*. 'I confeſs, *ſaith he*, I never 'ſaw any body, who in a cauſe, altogether criminal, 'came nearer the eloquence of the antients. It was an 'admirable thing to ſee with what words, what elo-'quence, what arguments, what countenance, what 'confidence, he anſwered his adverſaries, and that 'too after he had been three hundred and forty days 'in a deep and ſtinking dungeon.' Then he relates

‖ This Canon by which is defined that one is not bound to keep faith with hereticks, is to be ſeen in the 19th Seſſion of the Council of Conſtance.

§ Pertulerunt ambo conſtanti animo necem, & quaſi ad epulas invitati ad incendium properarunt, nullam emittentes vocem quæ miſeriam animi eſſet indicium. Ubi ardere cœperunt, hymnum cecinere, &c.

afterwards how a liſt of hereſies that were laid to his charge, was read unto him, and that upon every head or point he anſwered in ſuch ſort, as he did ſhew they were calumnies laid upon him, ſaying he believed nothing of all that. And being brought to the place of puniſhment, and compaſſed round about with faggots and ſtraw, he fell a ſinging of an hymn or pſalm. The executioner drawing near for to kindle the fire behind him, he ſaid unto him, 'friend, come near, 'put the fire here before me, for if I did fear the 'fire, I would not be here.' The aſhes of theſe martyrs were caſt into the lake of *Conſtance*, for to aboliſh the memory of them.

* In this council was framed a canon, whereby thoſe are declared hereticks, and puniſhable by the ſecular power, who for conforming themſelves unto Chriſt and unto the antient Church, will have the people to receive the Sacrament under both kinds.

There alſo was condemned *Wicklif*'s doctrine, to whom in that council are falſely attributed impious doctrines, and which never came into his mind. For example, 'that God ought to obey the devil; that a 'Prince is no lawful maſter, while he is in a mortal 'ſin; and that it belongs to the people to chaſtiſe their 'lord's.

In the like manner was handled *John Huz*, whoſe doctrine was condemned by the council of *Conſtance*, in the fifteenth ſeſſion; to whom alſo they did impute things far from his belief. Some witneſſes preſented themſelves, that teſtified they had heard him ſay, '† that the pardons of the Pope, and of the Biſhop, 'are nothing worth, unleſs God do forgive:' That was one of the crimes for which he was burned. For that venerable Council hath judged that the Pope may forgive ſins whether God will or no, and that

---

* Seſſion XII.

† Seſſion XI. Artic. 19. Dixerant ſe audiviſſe quod Johannes Huz dixiſſet, quod indulgentiæ Papæ & Epiſcopi non valent niſi Deus indulgeat.

God's

God's conſent is not neceſſarily required for to make that the Popes and Biſhops indulgences be of force and validity.

This news of *John Huz* his death, and of *Hierom* of *Prague*, brought into *Bohemia*, did pierce the hearts of the *Bohemians* that were called *Huſſites*, with exceeding grief. * The King ſeeing their number encreaſe daily more and more, granted them churches in *Prague* for their meetings. *Æneas Sylvius* ſaith, that the people moved with anger, pulled down ſome monaſteries and churches both within and without the city; namely, near *Tabor*, where thirty thouſand perſons did celebrate in the midſt of a field the holy communion under both kinds.

The King *Wenceſlaus* being dead, the Kingdom of *Bohemia* fell to *Sigiſmond* his brother, Emperor and King of *Hungaria*. Whereupon great fear did ſeize the people of *Bohemia*, becauſe of his great power, and that againſt his oath, and violating the ſafe conduct he had given to *John Huz* and to *Hierom* of *Prague*, he cauſed them to be burned at *Conſtance*.

But a *Bohemian* Gentleman called *Ziſca*, that had loſt an eye in the wars, a man incomparable for vigour of body and mind, exhorted them not to be diſcouraged. And it fell out at the ſame time, that *Sigiſmund* undertook war againſt the Turk in *Hungaria*, with an indifferent bad ſucceſs.

That gave leaſure to the people to order their buſineſſes. The Queen, widow to *Wenceſlaus*, levied ſome troops for to fall upon this people, and hinder their encreaſing. * *Sigiſmund* ſent Lieutenants to govern the Country, § and ſet things into good order again, in whoſe hands *Ziſca* did ſurrender and remit *Pelzina* and *Pleſta*, and other places whereof he had gotten poſſeſſion. For his deſire was to obey the Emperor, and he ſought all means to give him content. But there came Letters from the Emperor, whereby he did declare that his will and pleaſure was that the Churches

* Hiſtor. Bohemicæ cap. 36. § Cap. 39

granted

granted to the *Bohemians* called *Huſſites*, ſhould be taken from them, and their Religion interdicted. And they had good advice that *Sigiſmond*'s intention was to deſtroy them. Whereat the people being afraid, looked for nothing but for a total ruin: and their enemies being become more vigorous, began to oppreſs them. Which things moved *Ziſca* to take Arms, and think upon his defence. With a few forces he obtained many victories againſt the Queen, having none but foot Forces of ſmall Experience, and little exerciſed in War.

Then came *Sigiſmond* into *Bohemia* with a mighty Army, reſolved to deſtroy this people: Beſieged *Prague*, wherein *Ziſca* was, who in many ſallies defeated the moſt part of *Sigiſmond*'s army; made him raiſe the Siege and took many towns by the very terror of his name. As he was beſieging *Viſſegrad*, the Emperor came at unawares for to make him raiſe the ſiege, having with him thirty thouſand Horſe, and all the Nobility of *Moravia*. But *Ziſca* defeated him, and obtained upon him a great victory. And a little after, *Sigiſmond* having for the third time prepared a mighty Army, loſt a third Battle, by which he was conſtrained to leave *Bohemia*, full of ſhame and confuſion.

A little after *Ziſca* beſieging a town, ‡ received a ſhot of an arrow in the eye, ſo that, of blind of an eye as he was, he became blind of both. But that hindred him not from leading and conducting his troops, and giving many combats, being victorious every where.

But the Emperor being irritated and angry, came back again into *Bohemia*, bringing along with him two powerful armies, the one out of *Germany*, and the other out of *Hungaria*, which like an overflowing torrent, overwhelmed all *Bohemia*: Took ſome towns, and made great ravage. But *Ziſca*, though blind, and having but a few men, drew directly towards the Emperor's Army, and defeated him with a great defeat, took Bag and Baggage and all things belonging to the

‡ Cap. 44.

Army,

Army, and purſued him a whole day's Journey. *Pio* a *Florentine* had brought out of *Hungaria* fifteen thouſand horſe, who paſſing upon a frozen River for to ſave themſelves, the Ice breaking under them, were all drowned in the River.

Furthermore, *Ziſca* with his victorious Army went out of *Bohemia*, and entered into *Moravia*, and paſſed into *Auſtria*, and came to ſuccour the faithful that were oppreſſed there. To him did adjoin himſelf a *Moravian* gentleman named *Procopius*, exceeding valiant, and an imitator of the Virtue of *Ziſca*, who cauſed the Emperor *Sigiſmund* to raiſe the ſiege before *Jutemberg* in *Moravia*, which he had beſieged. A great Battle was given between *Ziſca* and the Emperor's troops near *Auſck*, upon the River of *Elbe*, where a great number of the *German* Gentry were killed on the Emperor's ſide. Who, pulled down and confounded with ſo many loſſes, reſolved at laſt to ſeek after *Ziſca* his love and friendſhip, promiſing him the General Lieutenancy of the whole Kingdom, and all kind of Advantages. *Ziſca* gave ear thereunto, and took his journey for to go meet the Emperor; but he fell ſick by the way and died, being very old, and blind. *Æneas Sylvius* ſaith, that when he was a dying, he gave counſel to his people to make a † Drum of his Skin after his death, aſſuring them that at the ſound of that Drum, his enemies would fly away.

Ziſca being dead, *Procopius* ſucceeded him in the conduct of a part of the troops againſt whom Pope *Martin* the fifth ſet all *Germany* in Arms, and ſent into *Bohemia* three mighty Armies, commanded by the Dukes of *Saxe*, the Marquels of *Brandenbourg*, and the Arch-Biſhop of *Trivers*. Theſe three Armies joyned themſelves together. But ſo ſoon as the *Bohemians* did appear, ſuch terror and fear ſeized upon the Imperial Armies, that they preſently fled without ſtaying for the enemy: forſaking all their baggage and munitions of war, but the Cardinal *Julian*, ſent by the

† Cap. 46.

Pope,

Pope, ſtirred up the Emperor *Sigiſmond* to make a greater effort than any of the former. *Æneas Sylvius* ſaith, there was in his Army forty thouſand Horſe beſides the Foot. This Cardinal entered into *Bohemia*, where he committed many unheard of cruelties, killing both women and children. But at the very firſt noiſe and rumour that came of the *Bohemians* approach, ſuch a terrible fear took this huge Army, that every one threw his arms down for to fly away more nimbly, and left their carriage and munitions of war to the Enemy.

The Cardinal having eſcaped this danger, came to *Baſile* for to preſide at the Council that the Pope *Eugenius* the fourth had aſſembled there, in the year of our Lord, 1431.

Now we have made this recital, not for to approve *Ziſca* his actions, nor the commotions of peoples taking arms againſt their Sovereign for to avoid perſecution and Martyrdom; For the truth of the Goſpel is not eſtabliſhed by theſe means; Chriſt Jeſus calleth us to bear the Croſs after him; The blood of Martyrs hath more efficacy for to encreaſe the Church and ſpread the doctrine of the Goſpel, than Battles; but I have repreſented this hiſtory, for to be an example of God's juſtice, puniſhing the diſloyalty of *Sigiſmond*, who againſt his faith and promiſe burned alive two faithful Martyrs, God having made uſe of weak and contemptible perſons for to make him loſe above two hundred thouſand men, and cover him with ſhame and confuſion.

CHAP. XII. *The Confeſſion of* Cyril *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *now living, touching the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.*

THIS Prelate, in the ſeventeenth Article of his Confeſſion, altogether conformable to the Doctrine of our Churches, after he hath recited the Inſtitution of the holy Supper as it is found in the Goſpel, addeth: *That is the ſimple, true, and lawful Inſtitution of this admirable Sacrament, in the adminiſtration*

whereof

whereof we do confeſs and believe the true and firm preſence of the Lord Chriſt Jeſus. Yet that preſence which faith offereth and makes preſent unto us: but not that which Tranſubſtantiation vainly invented, doth teach; for we believe that the faithful, in the holy Supper, do eat the body of Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, not in cruſhing and breaking it ſenſibly, and deſtroying it with our teeth in the participation, But in partaking thereof by the ſenſe of the ſoul. For the body of Chriſt is not that which is taken and ſeen in the Sacrament with the eyes, but that which faith having taken ſpiritually makes it preſent, and communicates it unto us. Therefore it is true that we eat it, and are made partakers of it, if we do believe; but if we believe not, we fall away from all the benefit of the Sacrament. By the ſame reaſon we believe, that to drink the Cup in the Sacrament, is to drink indeed the blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, after the ſame manner as hath been ſaid concerning the body. For the Lawgiver made the ſame commandment touching his blood, as he did touching his body. Which precept muſt not be mutilated, according to every ones fancy and humour: But the tradition that hath been preſcribed unto us, muſt be kept ſound and entire. When therefore in the Sacrament we have partaked worthily, and communicated intirely with the body and blood of Chriſt, we make this profeſſion, that we are already reconciled and united to our head, and made one and the ſelf ſame body, with a firm hope that we ſhall be his coheirs in his Kingdom.

Here is the Original in *Greek.*

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἁπλῶς ἀληθὴς καὶ γνησία τοῦ θαύματος μυστηρίου τούτου παράδοσις, ἣ τινος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διακονίᾳ τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ βεβαίαν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ πιστεύομεν. πλὴν ἣν πίστις ἡμῖν παρίστησιν καὶ προσφέρει, οὐχ ἣν ἡ ἐφευρεθεῖσα εἰκὴ διδάσκει, τοῦσίωσις Πιστεύομεν γὰρ τοὺς πίστει μεταλαμβάνοντας ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐσθίειν οὐκ αἰσθητῶς τοῖς ὀδοῦσι τρυχόντας καὶ ἀναλύοντας τὴν μεταληψιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθήσει κοινωνοῦντας τὸ γὰρ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπερ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρᾶται τι καὶ μεταλαμβάνεται ἀλλ ὅπερ πνευματικῶς ἡ πίστις λαβοῦσα ἡμῖν παρίστάνει τε καιχαρίζεται. ὅθεν ἀληθές ἐστιν ἐσθίειν ἡμᾶς καὶ μετέχειν καὶ κοινωνοὺς εἶναι, ἐαν πιστεύοιμεν ἐαν ἃ πιστεύοιμεν, παντὸς ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ μυστηρίου κερδαος ἀφίσασθαι. Ακολούθως τὸ ποτήριον πίνειν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ, εἶναι τὸ αἷμα πίνειν ἀληθῶς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν τρόπον καὶ περὶ τοῦ σώματος εἴρηται. Ο γὰρ νομοθέτης ὡς περὶ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἰδίου, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος ἐνετείλατο. ἦν ἐντολὴν ἃ δεῖ καλὰ τὸ δοκεῖν ἐκαστῳ κολοβοῦσθαι, ἀλλὰ σῶαν τηρεῖσθαι τὴν νομοτεθεῖσαν παράδοσιν. ὅταν οὖν ἀξίως μεθέξωμεν καὶ ὁλοκλήρως κοινωνήσωμεν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Κριστοῦ, ἕνωσις ἡμᾶς ἤδη ὁμολογοῦμεν διηλλαγμένους τῇ κεφαλῇ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡνωμένους καὶ συσσωμους. καλὰ βεβαίας ἐλπίδος, καὶ συγκληρονόμους ἔσεσθαι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ.

A LEARNED

TREATISE

OF

TRADITIONS,

Lately ſet forth in *French*,

By *PETER du MOULIN.*

And Faithfully done into *Engliſh* by *G. C.*

Si aut Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apoſtolorum Epiſtolis, aut Actibus continetur, &c. Obſervetur divina hæc & ſancta Traditio, Cypr. Epiſt. 74. ad Pomp.

DUBLIN:

Printed for WILLIAM BRIEN, Bookſeller in *Dame-Street.* MDCCL.

TRADITIONS.

DUBLIN:

TO

The Right Honourable my ſingular good

Lord, ROBERT, Earl of *Lindſey*,

Baron of *Willoughby*, *Beake* and *Erſby*, Lord great Chamberlain of *England*, and Lord High-Conſtable for this Time being: Lord Lieutenant of *Lincolnſhire*, and Vice-Admiral for the Coaſts of that County; Lord Warden of the Foreſt of *Waltham*, Knight of the moſt Noble Order of the Garter, and of his Majeſty's moſt Honourable Privy-Council.

My moſt honoured LORD,

IT is well known that your Lordſhip can as readily interpret my Author in his own Language and Idiom, as being thus changed into our native and moſt famiar Tongue. Nevertheleſs I have adventured (aſking pardon if my Boldneſs give Diſtaſte) to ſtile your Lordſhip the *Mæcenas* of this my Handy-work. My Weakneſs and want of Skill in every Reſpect, together with my Forwardneſs and Preſumption to intermeddle out of Element, have prompted me, to fly to the Sanctuary of your Lordſhip's Protection. Such as expect that I ſhould rather dedicate ſome Tac-

ticks or Book of Chevalry to your Lordſhip may take this for Satisfaction, that I have well obſerved your true Devotion to Religion, which is the beſt Ornament and Addition to your Honour; and great is the Happineſs when Religion and Military Profeſſion are met in ſo heroick a Center. The Variety ariſing from this copious Subject of *Traditions*, will invite your Lordſhip to read Du Moulin with Delight; but their modern Incroachment (I mean the Romiſh) upon the Church, and their preſumptuous Compariſon with the ſacred Scripture, will force your Lordſhip to reject them with Scorn and greateſt loathing. Caſt your eye upon this little Volume, and vouchſafe it your favourable opinion, ſuch Countenance will give it life; receive it into your Lordſhip's Patronage, for to that End I have preſented it, and in that Security I humbly leave it; recommending your Lordſhip to God's holy Safeguard.

Your Lordſhip's

moſt humble and

faithful Servant,

G. C.

TO THE

READER.

Courteous Reader,

WHEN you ſet apart ſome hours for ſerious ſtudies, imploy a few to the reading of this ſhort *Enchiridium*; a moſt exact ſurvey of *Romiſh Traditions*. You will find them here arraigned, by divine teſtimonies of Scripture, by ſolid interpretations of the Fathers, by effectual perſwaſions of reaſon, by the ridiculous impoſſibilities of their own ſufficiency, and by the ſelf-contradictions and confeſſions of all Projectors and Founders of them. The Frontiſpiece doth ſhew my Author to be French, and I have copied out his ſenſe into our mother Tongue, as near to life, as my running pen would give me leave. If any man object, What need of Tranſlations amidſt ſo many unparallel'd *Originals*, compoſed by the *Conductors* of our Church at home? I anſwer with a queſtion, Is it not pity ſo learned a book (amongſt us reformed Chriſtians) ſhould be guilty of that *Antichriſtian Tradition* caſt upon the Scripture, *Not to be publiſhed in a known Tongue?* But let me not wade over deep, into the commendation of this Treatiſe, leſt a cenſure of *Tractet fabrilia*, or ſome *Quæ ſupra nos, &c.* recoil upon me. Κρὴ καθ' αὑτὸν ἀεὶ παντὸς ὅρᾶν μέτρον. Every man ought to guide himſelf by the meaſure of his own ability. It is true that I was never worthy to make this holy Knowledge my Profeſſion, yet my zeal to it is ſuch, that if I may not act the part of

an

an *Encomiaſt* in the merit of DU MOULIN and his Works, I muſt take leave to gaze on him with ſilent admiration, and (paſſing over particularities) with this brief *Character*, only to point at him: *For general and profound ſcholarſhip*, he is, *Extra invidiæ aleam doctus*. What can be ſaid more? Let it ſuffice that I have named him; *Qui cognoiſt ſon nom aſſez entend ſon renom*, His meer name is the individual cognizance of his fame. Pardon me, if I yet ſtretch a note higher in praiſe of him; it is his due, it cannot be omitted without a national ingratitude. And what ſhould it be, but his ingenuous perſeverance to this very day, in vindicating the ſacred honour of his late Majeſty (the learned King JAMES of moſt happy and immortal memory) from the unjuſt redargutions of *Cardinal Perron* in a book which he hath written againſt the ſaid late King; as by thoſe often quotations in this Treatiſe expreſly made, may plainly appear? In the laſt place (my friendly *Reader*) if you afford me a favourable conſtruction of this my undertaking, and connive at ſuch errors as you meet with, you have done to my wiſhes; and in requital I paſs my word, that whatſoever is lame and defective, or verbally miſtaken at the Preſs in this tranſlated form, you ſhall find ſupplied in the real goodneſs of the Author's matter. Read and profit.

G. C.

A Table of the Chapters in this Treatiſe of Tradition.

Chap. 1. *Concerning the nature of this Controverſy:* Page 1.

Chap. 2. *Of the word* Tradition. 9.

Chap. 3. *The belief of our Churches. The Calumny of* Regourd. 10.

Chap. 4. *The opinion of the Romiſh Church. That our Adverſaries with one conſent accuſe the Scripture of inſufficiency,* &c. 13.

Chap. 5. *That our adverſaries ſay there are Doctrines and Articles of Chriſtian Faith, yea in the very eſſential things, which the Apoſtles have neither taught by mouth nor writing.* 19.

Chap. 6. *A proof of the ſame, becauſe our Adverſaries do affirm that the Pope and the Church of* Rome *may change that which God commandeth in the Scriptures, and infringe the Apoſtles Commandments.* 26.

Chap. 7. *Paſſages extracted out of the writings of our Adverſaries, which prove that in the Church of* Rome, *Traditions are without compariſon more eſteemed than the holy Scripture, and the Scripture charged with Injuries,* Regourd's *boldneſs to defame the ſame.* 34.

Chap. 8. *A proof of the ſame, by the practice of the Primitive Church.* 50.

Chap. 9. *Three reaſons wherefore Tradition is preferred before the Scripture,* &c. 54.

Chap. 10. *That in this Queſtion, by the word Church, our Adverſaries underſtand the Pope alone.* 57.

Chap. 11. *Of what ſort, how weak, and how uncertain the Foundations are whereon the Traditions of the* Romiſh *Church are built,* &c. 62.

Chap. 12. *That our Adverſaries alledging the Scripture, do contradict themſelves, and alledge Scripture for Tradition in general without touching the particulars, wherein they find the Scripture contrary.* 73

Chap. 13. *That our Adverſaries to diſtinguiſh the good Traditions from bad, do give a plea wherein they wholly convict themſelves.* 78.

Chap.

Chap. 14. *A proof of the ſame, by the Traditions which our Adverſaries do ſuppoſe to be the moſt ancient and beſt grounded in Antiquity.* p. 88.

Chap. 15. *The ſecond mark ſet by our Adverſaries, to diſtinguiſh the good Traditions from the bad, viz. Succeſſion.* 92.

Chap. 16. *That the Phariſees and ancient Hereticks had recourſe to Tradition, that* Clemens Alexandrinus *ſuffered himſelf to be too much carried away in the ſame.* 97.

Chap. 17. *An examination of the paſſages of Scripture, whereon they found Traditions.* 100.

Chap. 18. *An anſwer to that which is objected unto us, that the Church hath been ſometime without the Scripture.* 103.

Chap. 19. *That the Church of the old Teſtament, after the Law given by* Moſes *until Jeſus Chriſt, hath had no unwritten Traditions.* 105.

Chap. 20. *An anſwer to our adverſaries affirming, that we receive many* Traditions *contained in Scripture.* 112.

Chap. 21. *A proof of the ſufficiency and perfection of the Scriptures, by the teſtimony of God himſelf ſpeaking in the Scriptures.* 118.

Chap. 22. *Whether to ground a Doctrine, it be lawful to uſe words equivalent to thoſe that are found in the Scripture, or to uſe conſequences and Arguments.* 131.

Chap. 23. *Teſtimonies of the Fathers, touching the perfection of the Scripture.* 141.

Chap. 24. *How the Texts and paſſages of the Fathers, which our Adverſaries alledge for the unwritten Traditions, ought to be underſtood.* 154.

Chap. 25. *A proof of that which went before.* 155.

Chap. 26. *Three ancient Cuſtoms which we are blamed to have forſaken.* 175.

Chap. 27. *That the Traditions of the* Romiſh *Church of this Time have nothing in common with the unwritten Traditions mentioned by the Fathers.* 177.

Chap. 28. *Of the multitude of Traditions in the Church of* Rome. 179.

A LEARNED TREATISE OF TRADITIONS.

OF The Sacred Scriptures Perfection AGAINST The Traditions of the *Romiſh* Church.

CHAP. I. *Concerning the nature of this Controverſy.*

OUR Adverſaries were accuſtomed a great while to diſpute by way of Scripture; but at length perceiving themſelves weak in the cauſe, and being much diſquieted that the Scripture doth lock them up into ſo narrow a room, they ſpurn againſt it, labouring to make it appear doubtful, and without authority. By this means our Controverſies change their nature; for inſtead of diſputing by ground of Scripture, we are now led back to diſpute of the Scripture it ſelf, and to defend the Authority and Perfection of it. This is now the field wherein our Adverſaries do ſport, and

diſplay the metal of their conceits. They accuſe the Scripture of imperfection and inſufficiency, of obſcurity and uncapableneſs to determine any difference, calling it a dumb and imperfect rule, a noſe of wax, a rock of ſcandal, a ſcabbard, that receiveth as well a leaden, as a ſteel blade. And though the Church of Rome be party in the cauſe, yet will it be Judge ſupreme, and infallible. If the Church be Judge, ſhe of Rome will be Judge, and will have it appertain to her to preſcribe her taſk unto her ſelf, and to be ſovereign Judge of her own proper duty. Our Adverſaries make the Church of Rome the Judge infallible of her own proper infallibility, and that ſhe ſhall be ſovereign Judge of the interpretation of the ſame Laws, whereby God doth Judge her ſins. They ſtick not to ſay, that the Church of Rome is no way ſubject to the Scripture, that is to ſay, to God ſpeaking by his Prophets and Apoſtles. So on the other ſide they maintain, that the Scripture is ſubject to the Church of Rome, and ought to be regulated by the faith of that Church. They avow that to be the ſingular and only Church which giveth authority to the Scripture, and will have the Scripture inferior to the Church in dignity, in ſtability, in certainty, in antiquity, and in amplitude: Yea, ſo far they proceed, that the Pope may add to the Creed, diſpenſe contrary to the Apoſtles, alter that which God hath ordained in the holy Scriptures, and diſpoſe of his Commandments. They hold, that the ſacred Scripture be therefore entertained and received amongſt men, becauſe the Pope doth approve and ordain it ſo to be: As if the Pope were more to be credited then God, ſpeaking in his holy Scriptures; or that he were no whit ſubject to the Law of God contained in the Scripture.

In all this controverſy between the Scripture and the Church, concerning the preheminence, by this word *Church*, our Adverſaries always underſtand the Romiſh, although there be many other more antient and more pure; namely, the Greek,

the

the Syrian, the African, &c. And by the Romiſh Church they underſtand the Pope alone, in whom reſideth the ſovereign authority, and who judgeth all things without poſſibility to err; yea, then eſpecially when he judgeth alone *motu proprio*, of his own meer motion, and ſpeaking in the Chair Apoſtolique; and when it is his pleaſure to join unto him ſome Prelates for his aſſiſtance in Decreeing, he reinveſteth them with infallible knowledge and underſtanding, yea in the points which he himſelf underſtandeth not.

Whoſoever will here open his eyes, and not forbid himſelf the uſe of reaſon, ſhall eaſily perceive, that Satan by this proceeding endeavoureth ſlily to bring in Atheiſm, and to undermine the foundations of Chriſtian Religion. For by this means the Chriſtian Faith is not founded upon the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, but upon human and uncertain evidence, yea, the moſt uncertain that can be conceived; they juſtifying the authority of the Church of Rome to be only eſtabliſhed upon the teſtimony of the Romiſh Church, making her Judge, Witneſs, and Party in the ſame Cauſe, and endeavouring to make men believe, that the Church of Rome hath more authority than the Scriptures, for ſhe herſelf doth ſay it.

If it be ſo, that the authority of the Scripture be grounded upon the authority of the Church of Rome, why do they alledge unto us paſſages of Scripture to ſupport the authority of the Church of Rome.

And when inſtead of directing the Faith of a Chriſtian by the Word of God, ſpeaking in the Scriptures, they ſend him to the Church, the ſimple people are perplexed and hindred from chuſing the beſt Church amongſt many contrary. How ſhall they chooſe? How ſhall they diſcern the true Church from the falſe? Shall they know it in examining her doctrine by the Scripture? that may not be; for the Scripture is a Book that the people are not permitted to read: And our adverſaries affirm, that the Church is not ſubject or bound to the Scripture, and that the Church may

change the ſame which God commanded in the Scripture.

Shall they diſcern the true Church by antiquity and ſucceſſion? Nor that; for the Syrian and Greek Churches (contrary to the Romiſh) are more antient than that of Rome, deriving their ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; and punctually to judge in this ſucceſſion and antiquity, infinite Hiſtories both Greek and Latin ought to be read, wherein the people underſtand little or nothing: And amongſt the Clergy it ſelf, ſcarce one of an hundred is found, that hath but ordinary or competent knowledge therein. He that but entereth into the view thereof, ſhall diſcover the ſeat of the Roman Pontifics defiled with hereſies and enormous crimes, yea mangled and rent with Schiſms that are decided by ſtroke of ſword; and according to the power of Emperors and Kings doth the ſcale weigh down.

Shall they have reſpect to the generality and multitude? No, Jeſus Chriſt calleth his Church a little flock, *Luke*, 12. 32, and ſignifieth unto us, that the multitude and broad way lead to perdition, *Matth.* 7. 13. 14.

Shall they give heed to miracles? No, the Apoſtle hath foretold us, that the ſon of perdition, who is Antichriſt, ſhall come with ſigns, and miracles, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9. And Jeſus Chriſt admoniſheth us, that falſe Prophets ſhall ariſe, and ſhall make ſigns, and wonders to ſeduce, *Matth.* 24. 24. Now ſeeing that ſo many falſe miracles are wrought, and the moſt predominant Courts of Juſtice have made many decrees againſt the workers of them, how and by what marks ſhall the poor people diſtinguiſh the true miracles from the falſe, ſeeing there is no knowledge of the true doctrine declaring God's will that we ſhould diſcern the miracles? *Deut.* 13, *v.* 1 2 & 3. Briefly, it is certain, that the Scriptures authority being no more the foundation and direction of the believers faith, all Religion vaniſheth, and turneth into ſmoke, and there remains nothing but to believe at adventure,

to

to follow the generality, and like blind men to lay hands on him that marcheth next before us.

It is anſwered, that in this perplexity the people are to follow their Doctors and Paſtors, for they are the men that undertake with God for the people. What? Muſt every man believe the Paſtors of his own country? Muſt they follow the Church wherein they are born? Shall man owe his Religion to his birth, or the cuſtom of his country, or the ſucceſs of affairs? If it be anſwered, that by the Paſtors and Doctors, thoſe of the Church of Rome are to be underſtood, therein lies the point of difficulty. For the queſtion is, if thoſe Doctors be found and good, teaching the true way of health, conformably to the word of God, which they conceal from the people, in denying them to read the holy Scriptures; then are the people bound to believe, that theſe are good Doctors, before they know the good doctrine; and that this Church is the true Church, before they know or apprehend the truth. They are alſo bound to believe what the Church of Rome believeth, not knowing what that Church ought to believe. But if it be their tenet, that every particular perſon be aſſiſted with the Spirit of God, to be able to diſcern the true Church; why hold they not that he be aſſiſted with the ſame ſpirit to diſcern the true doctrine, and to examine it by the holy Scriptures, ſeeing that the true Church cannot be diſtinguiſhed but by the true doctrine? For the true faith is firſt to be known before the true faithful can be diſtinguiſhed; and the true rule is to be well underſtood, before thoſe that follow it can be known. Chriſt muſt firſt be known, before there is poſſibility of knowing undoubtedly, what Church is truly his flock.

Add likewiſe hereunto, that the faith of the Romiſh Doctors dependeth entirely upon the *Pope's* faith; nevertheleſs they (for the greateſt part) do believe that the *Pope* may err; and the *Popes* themſelves do confeſs the ſame, as we have elſewhere proved. Yea, their errors are condemned by thoſe Councils, which the Church of Rome did allow. And it is hard to be-

lieve that he cannot err, who boaſteth of his authority and power, to change that which God hath ordained, and to diſpenſe with his commandments.

Add moreover, that the greateſt flatterers of the *Popes*, that have written their hiſtories and lives, do lament the corruption of that ſeat, and complain of the traffique it exerciſeth, and of the infamous living of many *Popes*, and their intolerable pride: For what doth the *Pope*? He is advanced ſo far as to call himſelf God, and the divine Majeſty, to cauſe himſelf to be adored, to reach forth to Emperors a pantable to be kiſſed, to diſpoſe the crowns and lives of Kings, and to releaſe ſouls out of Purgatory: Inſomuch as from a poor Biſhop of a city, who in the Primitive time appeared not but in the Martyrdoms, is by degrees become a great Monarch of the earth, that ſurpaſſeth in riches and treaſure the greateſt Kings of the world.

Theſe things conſidered may well fix in our minds a juſt cauſe to ſuppoſe, that the *Pope* is the ſame man that the Scripture hath foretold to come into the world, to * *lift himſelf up into the throne of Roman Emperors, ſtile himſelf God, vaunt of ſigns and miracles; he that ſhould be cloathed in ſcarlet, ſhould poſſeſs his ſeat in a town of ſeven mountains,* (which is Rome's deſcription,) *ſhould ſeduce Kings, wage war againſt the Church, and vanquiſh it, and all this under the name of Chriſtian, aſſuming to himſelf the title and authority of Jeſus Chriſt.* For ſo ſaith the Spirit of God in the 13 of the *Apocalypſe: He ſhall have the horns of a Lamb, but ſhall ſpeak like a dragon.* Theſe things having been foretold above fifteen hundred years paſt, no man ſince that time hath ſo ſwelled himſelf to ſo high a pitch, as to have theſe recited things appropriated unto him,

* 2 Theſſ. 2. 7 & 8. Apoc. 13. 11. 2 Theſſ. 2. v. 4 & 9. Apocal. 17. 3. 4. 9. 18. Apocal. 17. 2. Apocal. 31. 15.

but

but the *Pope* of *Rome*. Is it by chance or adventure, that ſuch prerogatives have met in one man? Surely theſe conſiderations are ſufficient to cauſe a ſuſpicion in us, that this is the man who ſhould have more authority than the Scripture, that would have himſelf believed, when he ſaith that the Scripture is ſubject unto him, and that he hath power to change it, that is to ſay, to contradict it. For no man can extol himſelf above the Scripture, unleſs it be meerly to impugne it.

Now though man fearing God, and touched with the zeal of his houſe, cannot ſee the Scriptures, (that are d vinely inſpired) to be ſo injuriouſly deſpighted, without extream horror and grief; and though it be a very prodigy or wonder of men, that call themſelves Chriſtians, but ſo pour out their hearts in invectives againſt the Scripture, (whereof neither *Porphyry*, nor *Lucian*, nor the moſt capital enemies of the Chriſtian name were ever adviſed): Yet to us is it a ſubject of joy, and no little conſolation in the midſt of reproaches caſt upon us, to be imployed to ſpeak in God's behalf, and to defend the honour of his word, againſt men perverſly ingenious to defame it. For it is better to ſuffer for him, than to triumph without him. There is not a more honourable blemiſh, nor more honeſt diſgrace, than to be defamed, and oppreſſed for his name.

True it is, that the ſtain and diſreputation exceed our ſtrength, and it is no eaſy matter to ſpeak worthily of the condign honour belonging to holy Scripture, and with imperfect minds to defend her perfection, it were in ſome ſort to light the day with a candle, and to demonſtrate the Sun with the finger, as to endeavour to arrive at the bright evidence of the Scripture: for at all times all that we can perform is leſs clear than her perfection. I hold it therefore expedient to publiſh to the light the ſcandals and accuſations which our adverſaries do raiſe againſt the Scripture, and to ſhew how God hath ſtrucken them with the ſpirit of amazement; as alſo to compare the wickedneſs and

vanity of the *Romiſh* Traditions, with the perfection and ſanctity of the holy Scripture. And we hope that in this ſo holy and juſt quarrel God will aſſiſt us, and that he will vouchſafe us the grace to maintain the honour of his Word, by ſuch means as are moſt agreeable to his Word: and that he who hath confounded the tongues of the builders of *Babel*, will confound the thoughts and ſpirits of thoſe that labour daily to rebuild it.

In my three former Treatiſes, entituled, *The Judge of Controverſies*, I have defended the authority of the Scripture, and ſhewn that our adverſaries in this cauſe have not only the Scripture contradicting them, but alſo themſelves, common ſenſe, antiquity and experience; and that they are not only at variance among themſelves, but every one particularly thwarteth himſelf. It remains now to ſpeak of the perfection of the Scripture, and to ſhew that our adverſaries wrongfully find fault therein, and moſt injuriouſly accuſe it of inſufficiency.

Theſe two Queſtions, the one touching *the authority* of the Scripture, the other as concerning *her perfection*, are linked together inſeparably. Theſe two properties of Scripture reciprocally embrace one the other, and afford to themſelves mutual ſuccour. For the Scripture itſelf by her authority maintaineth her ſufficiency, and her ſufficiency giveth her authority. And whoſoever withſtandeth the authority of the Scripture, fighteth alſo againſt her perfection; for if the Scripture be ſovereign judge it is deficient in nothing to judge well. And it is certain that ſhe cannot be Judge of points whereof ſhe ſpeaketh not. If ſhe be wanting in any thing, ſome ſuperior authority muſt ſupply her default. And if our Adverſaries have reaſon to ſay that the Church of *Rome* is the rule of Scripture, for a certain it is of that Church wherein we ought to learn, whether there be any imperfection in the Scripture: but the deciſion of the queſtion touching the Scriptures authority, levelleth the way for us to the queſtion concerning her perfection: which ſhall be (if God permit)

mit) this laſt Treatiſe, wherein we defend the abſolute perfection of the Scripture, againſt the Appendixes and Additions of the *Romiſh* Church, which men call *Traditions*; yea againſt men that with a depraved ſubtilty ſearch and hunt after defects in Scripture; like unto *Holland* ſpectacles, that diſcover ſpots and ſtains in the ſhining ſun.

When we compare the *Romiſh* Traditions with the doctrine of holy Scripture, they will be found not only infinitely beneath the ſanctity and excellence of the Scriptures, and as coals mingled amongſt Diamonds: but alſo contrary to them, and mere inſurrections againſt God's commandments, under colour of addition. It will be found, that theſe Traditions, which they derive and make to deſcend from the Apoſtles, are forged *de novo*, and reſemble the *Gibeonites* who being very near, ſpoke as if they were come from far. It will appear that theſe Traditions which men exalt in general, when they come to a particular ſcanning, they are but a frivolous bundle of human inventions, contrived for gain, and of malicious deceits, to ſubdue the people under the Eccleſiaſtiques, and to retain them in blind ignorance.

CHAP. II. *Of the word Tradition.*

IT will be neceſſary to expound the word before we ſpeak of the matter. This word *Tradition* ſignifieth a doctrine given by ſucceſſion from hand to hand. From whence we conclude, that the holy Scripture, the Law of God, and the Goſpel are Traditions. The Apoſtle St. *Paul*, in his firſt chapter to the *Galat.* v. 14. * affirmeth himſelf to be *exceedingly zealous of the Traditions of his Fathers*; calling ſo the law of *Moſes*, whereof he had been very zealous, or at leaſt comprehending it in theſe Traditions. The ſame Apoſtle in the ſecond to the *Theſſal.* chap. 2. v. 15.

---

* ζηλώτης ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.

exhorteth them *to preſerve the Traditions which they had learned either from his mouth or by his Epiſtle*, calling the doctrine which he had written unto them a Tradition. And in the 15 chap. to the *Corinth.* the 1. * *I have given you by Tradition*, (for ſo is the Greek word) *that Jeſus Chriſt is dead for our ſins, according to the Scriptures.* He then calleth *Tradition* that which is in the Scripture. Juſt in the ſame manner ſpeaketh he in the ſame Epiſtle at the 23. verſe of the 11. chapter.

Thus ſpeak the Fathers. *Cyprian* in his 74. Epiſt. to *Pomp.* § *If it be commanded in the Goſpel, or contained in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, or in the Acts, let this divine and holy Tradition be obſerved.* And *Baſil* in the third Book againſt *Eunomius:* † *The Lord himſelf in the Tradition of ſaving Baptiſm, gave this order, ſaying, As you go along, baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt.*

But Cuſtom hath prevailed, that by this word *Tradition*, ſome Document, Rule, Recital, or Ceremony in matter of God's Service, not contained in the holy Scriptures be obſerved. And ſo ſhall the word be taken in all this Treatiſe.

CHAP. III. *The belief of our Churches. The calumny of* Regourd *a Jeſuit.*

THE fifth article of our confeſſion expreſſeth, that *the holy Scripture is the rule of all variety, containing all that is neceſſary for the ſervice of God*

---

* παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ὅτι χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.

§ Si ergo aut Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apoſtolorum epiſtolis aut actibus continetur, &c. obſervetur divina hæc & ſancta traditio.

† αυτῦ τῦ κυρίου ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος παραδεδωκότος την τάξιν, πορευθέντες βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τῦ πατρὸς &c.

and

and our own ſalvation, whereunto it is not lawful to add, diminiſh, or change.

Hereby we intend not abſolutely to reject all Tradition: for if there be a Tradition that addeth nothing to the Scripture, but ſerveth only to maintain her authority and perfection, we embrace that moſt willingly. Such a Tradition is *that the Books of the old and new Teſtament are ſacred and Canonical.* This Tradition is ſo far from adding to the Scripture that on the contrary it ſaith, that nothing ought to be added thereunto. Neither is it without the compaſs of the Scripture, ſeeing that it ſpringeth and reſults from the perfection of the Scripture itſelf; and the credit or teſtimony that a Church (be it true or falſe) conferreth upon theſe Books, is but a probable and human teſtimony, until God (giving efficacy to this Scripture to touch and ſtir up devotion) imprinteth in it a more effectual perſwaſion. For it is not the Church that giveth faith, but the ſpirit of God that worketh in our hearts by his powerful word.

As a river that paſſeth through a town, is ſufficient to refreſh and water it throughout, yet notwithſtanding is it behoveful that ſome Pipe or Channel ſhould conduct it from the ſource into the place: ſo the holy Scripture is ſufficient to inſtruct us to ſalvation, nevertheleſs it muſt come to us as it were by the courſe of ſucceſſive Tradition. Such a Tradition addeth no more to the Scripture, than the channel addeth to the water of the River.

Alſo when we reject unwritten Traditions, we intend not to reject all the words that are not found in the Scripture, in regard that we may there find the matter in ſubſtance and equivalent terms, and that theſe words do add nothing to the doctrine of ſalvation contained in the Scriptures. Such are the terms of *God's providence*, and of the *Immortality of the Soul.* Likewiſe the words of *Trinity*, *Conſubſtantial*, and the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, words profitably imployed by our forefathers, to make that perſpicuous which is contained in the Scriptures, and to ſhut up hereticks into a more narrow ſtrait.

Alſo

Alſo we willingly admit of unwritten Traditions which concern not the doctrine, but only the Eccleſiaſtical policy, and outward order, in regard that ſuch Laws and Cuſtoms are not given for abſolutely neceſſary, and equalled with the doctrine of Salvation: as alſo, becauſe they ſerve not the Paſtors uſe for traffick, avarice, or ambition; and that in this order and outward policy there is nothing diſhoneſt, and contrary to good morality, or that may expoſe the Chriſtian Religion to ridiculouſneſs; and laſtly, becauſe that with theſe Ceremonies and obſervations the multitude is not exceſſive, neither do they divert the piety by poſtures of the countenance, or the ſpiritual ſervice by corporal exerciſe. For as the *Romans* having conquered a Province, did amuſe the people with Sports and pompous Triumphs, feaſting them with their ſpoils, whilſt they were then buſy in plotting and aggravating the peoples ſervitude: ſo doth the enemy of our ſalvation amuſe the people by the ſplendour of Ceremonies, whilſt he then inthralleth conſciences, and tacitly inſinuateth idolatry; to which, the very inclination of the people doth much contribute. For a man naturally loveth rather to recreate his ſenſe, than to inſtruct his underſtanding; to behold publick ſpectacles, than hear wholeſome doctrines; to admire pictures, than edify by good precepts; and findeth leſs difficulty to ſhape ſtones to the image of man, than to unſhape or reform man to the image of God.

Our confeſſion then rejecteth only the Traditions, that add ſomething to the doctrine of faith and manners contained in the Scripture, and which are given forth to ſupply that which is thought to be wanting in the doctrine of the holy Scriptures.

The Jeſuit *Regourd* * in his book entitled *Catholick Demonſtrations*, in the fixth Demonſtration, propoſeth falſely our Belief. He alledgeth the words of the fifth Article of our confeſſion of the faith, where he makes us ſay, that *the Word of God contained in the Books received by us, is guided with all verity, and containeth*

* Page 786, 787.

containeth all that is neceſſary for the ſervice of God, and for our own ſalvation, and that by it all things ought to be examined and ſquared; Antiquity, Cuſtoms, the Multitude, human Wiſdom, Judgments, Sentences, Edicts, Decrees, Councils, Viſions, Miracles. But he changeth the words of our Confeſſion by a moſt notorious falſification: for we ſay only that theſe things muſt not be oppoſed againſt the Scripture. Mark our very words: *It is not lawful for men nor Angels to add thereunto, nor diminiſh, nor change. Whence it followeth, that neither Antiquity, nor Cuſtoms, nor the Multitude, &c. ought to be oppoſed againſt the holy Scripture.* We condemn not Antiquity, nor Councils, as *Regourd* impoſeth upon us; but we ſay, that he that would oppoſe theſe things againſt the Scripture, ought not to be believed. We affirm this, becauſe our Adverſaries ſay, that the *Romiſh* Church may change that which God hath commanded in the Scripture, diſpenſe God's word contrary to the Apoſtle, and eſtabliſh new Articles of Faith: whereof we have ſet down multitudes of proofs, in the forepart of our firſt Book, and will produce more here following.

CHAP. IV. *The opinion of the* Romiſh *Church. That our Adverſaries with one conſent accuſe the Scripture of inſufficiency, and of not containing all the doctrines neceſſary to ſalvation.*

WHEN our Adverſaries diſpute againſt Pagans, and compare the holy Scripture with human wiſdom, they exalt the ſanctity, perfection, authority, perſpicuity, and divine efficacy of the holy Scripture; yea, you would imagine they accorded with us, and borrowed our terms. But when the queſtion is of comparing the Scripture with the Church of *Rome*, then alter they their language, debaſing the dignity of the Scripture, to the end to magnify the authority of the Pope. They uphold, that the Scripture is not Judge, and that this title appertains unto the Pope, and to the Prelates which he authoriſeth; then (I ſay) they make all authority of the Scripture to depend upon the

power and teſtimony of the *Romiſh* Church. They accuſe the Scripture of incertitude, of being depraved, of obſcurity, of inſufficiency, and imperfection.

But if one repreſent unto them their own proper words, wherein they commend the perfection of the Scripture, and acknowledge that it containeth all that is neceſſary to ſalvation, they have an evaſion ready at hand, for they ſay that the Scripture may be called perfect, becauſe ſhe referreth to the Church, which ſupplieth all her defects. Wherein they apparently contradict themſelves. For if the Scriptures ſend back to the Church to learn of her wherein they are defective, by the ſame meſſage and ſending back they confeſs their own imperfection. The merchant that ſendeth away his chapman to another ſhop, to find that which he hath not in his own, by this diſmiſſion he confeſſeth that his own ſhop is ill furniſhed. And if it be ſufficient for the Scripture to be called perfect, when as ſhe ſends us to the Church, it is moſt certain, that inſtead of all the Scripture, one ſole line might ſuffice, ſpeaking thus; 'go but to the church of '*Rome*, and ſhe will teach you all things infallibly.'

Now to underſtand what is the imperfection whereof our adverſaries accuſe the Scripture, let us obſerve what they diſcourſe upon the ſame.

The Council of *Trent* in the fourth ſeſſion pronounceth, that the Church ſhall receive and honour the unwritten traditions with equal affection of piety and reverence as the holy Scripture. 'The 'hallowed ſynod *(ſay theſe Fathers)* receives and ho-'noureth with like affection of godlineſs and reverence 'all books as well of the Old as the New Teſtament, 'and the traditions appertaining to faith and man-'ners as dictated only by the mouth of Chriſt, or

---

• Omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Teſtamenti nec non Traditiones ipſas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Chriſto, vel à ſpiritu ſancto dictatas pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentia ſuſcipit ac veneratur.

'by

'by his holy ſpirit.' Yea by this decree the commandments of the Church of *Rome* are equal to the law of God, and the doctrine of the Goſpel contained in the New Teſtament. By this rule the invocation of Saints commanded by tradition, ought to be done with like piety and reverence, as the invocation of God commanded in the holy Scripture.

By the authority of this Council a Catechiſm was framed, which in the very entry and beginning placeth this maxim, '† that all doctrine which ought to be 'given to the faithful, is contained in the word of 'God, which is divided into Scripture and Tradi-'tions;' whence grew up the diſtinction of the word written and unwritten.

Gregory de Valentia, the Jeſuit, in the fifth book of his *Analyſis*, and title of the third chapter, '‡ The 'Scripture is not a ſufficient rule of faith, for it con-'taineth not all things.'

Cardinal *Bellarmin* a Jeſuit, in his book of the unwritten word, chap. 4. '§ The Scriptures without 'Traditions are not ſimply neceſſary nor ſufficient.' And there again he calleth the Scripture *regulam non totalem, ſed partialem*, a rule not entire, but a piece or parcel of a rule.

The Jeſuit *Baile* in the 9th queſtion of his catechiſm, 'I will make you point it with your finger, that the 'Scripture is not ſufficient.'

Peter Charron, in the fourth chapter of his third Verity, ſaith, 'that to require all to be proved by 'Scripture, is an unjuſt demand.' And not much after, 'The Scripture is nothing but a little parcel of 'truth revealed.

---

† Catechiſmus ad parochos ex Decreto Concilii Trid. Pii. 4. Pont. Max. juſſu editus. Omnis doctrinæ ratio quæ fidelibus tradenda ſit, quod in Scripturam traditioneſque diſtributum eſt.

‡ Scripturam non eſſe ſufficientem fidei regulam, quia non continet omnia.

§ Scripturas ſine Traditionibus nec fuiſſe ſimpliciter neceſſarias, nec ſufficientes.

Salmeron

Salmeron the Jeſuit, in his thirteenth tom. of the firſt book of his commentaries upon the epiſtles of Saint *Paul*, ‘ ‖ It is a ſottiſhneſs to think that the Apoſtles ‘ have written all things, or have given all by tradi- ‘ tion, That would turn to an injury againſt the Holy ‘ Ghoſt operating and revealing: and it would be a ‘ thing repugnant to our nature, that comprehendeth ‘ not all things at a clap.

Of which unwritten traditions that have been ſtarted ſince the Apoſtles time, he fetcheth ſome examples; to wit *, the eccleſiaſtical hierarchy, that is to ſay, the Papal Monarchy, with the ſubordinate degrees; † the ſervice of Images, and the ſuffrages of the dead ‡, the Maſs, and manner of ſacrificing, and the tradition that Jeſus Chriſt hath made a ſacrifice in bread and wine; and that he then made the chriſm, &c. He rendreth the reaſon why theſe things ſhould not be written; to the end, ‘ †‖ that the commandment of Je- ‘ ſus Chriſt be kept, who chargeth in this manner, ‘ give not to dogs that which is holy.’ Upon this Jeſuit's reckoning, the doctrine of the birth and death of our Saviour was given to dogs, when it was digeſted in writing. And God gave his law to dogs, when he wrote it in two tables. But as for the Papal Hierarchy, image-ſervice *Romiſh* indulgencies, invocation of Saints, *&c.* God would not have ſuch holy things to be caſt to dogs, nor hath he permitted them to be written.

And there again; ‘ § waxing inſolent and froward, ‘ they cannot be vanquiſhed by the Scriptures, there-

---

‖ Part. 3. diſp. 8. §. Quint. traditio. Stultum eſt omnia ab Apoſtolis ſcripta putare, vel omnia ab eis tradita fuiſſe. Et in injuriam vergeret agentis & revelantis Spiritus: Et inſuave eſſet naturæ noſtræ, quæ omnia ſimul non capit.

* §. Quint. opus.

† §. Poſtremo.

‡ §. Porro.

†‖ §. Quint. opus. Hæc literis conſignari minimè debuerunt, ut ſervaretur præceptum Chriſti; Nolite dare ſanctum canibus.

§ Tertio. Protervire volentes ſcripturis refelli non poſſunt, ideo ſola traditione jugulandi ſunt.

‘ foro

'fore muſt their throats be cut with one Tradition 'alone.

Coſter a Jeſuit, in the Preface of his Manuel, '* The 'Hereticks of our time do ſtick to the Scriptures as to 'a rock.' That diſpleaſeth the Doctor, for, ſaith he, 'In the Parchments as well of the Old as New Tef-'tament many things are wanting.' And further, 'they fear not to affirm with great impudence, that 'all things are contained in the Scripture.' And a little after, '† it ſeems that Jeſus Chriſt forbad all the 'doctrines of faith to be couched in writing, when he 'ſaid, give not to dogs that which is holy.' As if 'the Scriptures were made for the dogs. And who may theſe dogs be but the Chriſtian People? Now ſeeing that Jeſus Chriſt hath given the ſcripture to theſe dogs, that is to ſay, to the people, wherefore doth the Pope take from them that which Jeſus Chriſt hath given unto them, in debarring them of the reading?

Reaſon would require, that our Adverſaries ſpecify unto us, what are the doctrines that are wanting in the Scripture, and that they make us a catalogue of their Traditions. But they have not dared to do it hitherto, fearing to affright the people with a multitude of doctrines, which they have patched to the word of God.

We learn by the Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent* ‡, that beſides the publick Seſſions of the Council, they cauſed congregations to be made of Prelates and Doctors, to make draughts of the decrees which ſhould be propoſed to the Council, and when theſe were afterwards to be read in full Council, the Fathers gave their ſuffrage by the word *Placet*, without ſcruple or

---

* Præfat. Enchirid. Noſtri temporis hæretici ad ſolas Scripturas tanquam ad ſaxum adhæreſcunt. Idem cap. de ſacra ſcript. In membranis tam novi quam veteris Teſtam. multa deſiderantur.
† In ea tamen omnia non contineri valde impudenter affirmare non verentur. A Chriſto videtur cautum ne omnia fidei dogmata ſcriptis commendarentur, dum ait, Nolite dare ſanctum canibus.
‡ Hiſt. del Concilio Trident. lib. 2. Anno. 1546.

difficulty

difficulty therein, receiving the ſaid decree as a Law already ratified by the Pope's Legates. Before the fourth Seſſion was held, wherein was eſtabliſhed the decree touching Traditions, ſome ſelected Doctors were aſſembled to frame this decree, which was for a long ſpace debated. Some interpoſing, that it was neceſſary a decree ſhould be made, wherein it ſhould be declared, that all the Catholick doctrine is founded upon Tradition, in regard that the Scripture itſelf is not to be believed, but by the leave and means of Tradition that miniſtreth authority unto it.

Vincent Lunel, a Cordelier was of opinion to make a decree of the authority of the Church, before Traditions ſhould be mentioned, becauſe theſe are grounded upon the authority of the Church, and the Church is that which affordeth all authority to the Scriptures. To which opinion the Legates would not condeſcend, fearing that hereby the memory of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* ſhould be revived, which have adjudged, and definitively determined, that the ſovereign authority of the Church abideth in the Council, and not in the Pope, and that the Pope is ſubject to the Council, and that to enter into diſpute hereon, were to ſignify that it is not yet known who ſhould be judge.

But *Anthony Mariner* the Carmelite, a ſage and learned man, was of opinion, that nothing at all ſhould be ſpoken of Traditions, alledging; that without all doubt God under the Old Teſtament had commanded *Moſes* to write his book of the law, charging the Kings to read it carefully, and to put a copy of it into the Ark of the Covenant; but ſaith, that under the New Teſtament the Scripture is not neceſſary, in reſpect that Jeſus Chriſt hath written his doctrine in men's hearts, without need either of Tables, Ark or book. He further ſaith, that if there were no Scripture at all, yet the Church ſhould loſe nothing of her perfection. It is true, that God hath not forbidden his Apoſtles to write, but ſo alſo is it certain, that they have not written by his commandment, and it is an abuſe to ſay, that God hath com-

commanded them to write one part of the doctrine, and forbidden them to write the other. Again he preſſeth, that if any man be of a contrary opinion, he ſhould have too main difficulties to unfold, the one to declare the things forbidden to be written; the other to tell us who hath made thoſe men that came after the Apoſtles ſo adventurous and bold, to commit to writing that which God had forbidden his Apoſtles to write. Laſtly, he ſaith, that if any man avowed it to be chance and without expreſs commandment from God, that ſome things have been written, and others not, he ſhould accuſe the providence of God, in taking no care of ſo important a matter, and ſhould call into doubt the aſſiſtance of the holy Spirit, that hath inſtructed the Apoſtles to write. For theſe reaſons was he of opinion to make no compariſon of Traditions with the Scripture, ſince by this means alſo they might paſs over the Scripture.

But Cardinal *Pool* an *Engliſh* man, and third Legate, did utterly renounce this opinion. Yet for all that there was a decree framed, wherein (without mentioning the authority of the Church, or that Traditions are above the Scripture) it is averred, that ſimply the Scripture and Traditions ought to be received with equal piety and reverence. Which is a perpetual rule that the Council hath obſerved, to deviſe empty decrees, not expreſſing the moiety of the Church of *Rome*'s opinion, and that in ambiguous words, to the end, that upon all occaſions they may make interpretations fit for their own turns.

CHAP. V. *That our Adverſaries ſay there are doctrines and articles of Chriſtian Faith, yea in the very eſſential things, which the Apoſtles have neither taught by mouth nor writing.*

OUR Adverſaries are not contented to accuſe the Scripture alone of imperfection, but they find alſo a deficiency in the Apoſtles preaching, and ſay, that

that they have not taught all by word of mouth. So as by their account the holy Scripture and Apoſtolick Traditions coupled together make not an entire body of the Chriſtian doctrine. They alſo freely confeſs, that the Popes have added from age to age divers Traditions, according as they have thought them neceſſary; and that not only in things of leſs importance, but alſo in matters eſſential to the Chriſtian faith.

Bellarmin in his fourth book of the unwritten word of God, chap. 2. * calleth ſome Traditions *Divine*, which Jeſus Chriſt hath taught by mouth, and have not been ſet down in writing. Others he calleth *Apoſtolick*, which the Apoſtles have taught by word of mouth, and never wrote them. And the laſt he calleth *Eccleſiaſtical*, which he ſaith, '† are introduced 'from antient cuſtoms by the Prelates, or by the 'People, and creepingly by the ſilent and unqueſtion-'ing agreement of the People, have gained as it 'were ſtrength of law.' In which diſtinction he clearly acknowledgeth, that the Traditions which he ſtileth *Apoſtolick*, are not *Divine*; and that *Eccleſiaſtical* are neither *Divine* nor *Apoſtolical*. Whence it is manifeſt, with what ſubtilty our Adverſaries commonly attribute the title of *Apoſtolical* to all Traditions indifferently, as if they were all derived from the Apoſtles; and how falſely they comprehend Traditions under the title of *the unwritten Word of God*, when as by their own confeſſions a great part of theſe Traditions is not the Word of God. For Traditions that are not *divine*, are neceſſarily *human*. And this is evidently ſeen in the Prayer Books for certain hours, and the duties wherewith they charge

---

* §. Eſt autem. Prior partitio Traditionum eſt in divinas Apoſtolicas. Eccleſiaſticas.

† Eccleſiaſticæ Traditiones propriè dicuntur conſuetudines quædam antiquæ vel à Præſulibus vel à populis inchoatæ, quæ paulatim tacito conſenſu populorum vim legis obtinuerunt. Idem habet Salmeron, Tom. 13. Diſp. 8.

the

the people, unto whom they firſt commit God's Ten Commandments, and then the Commandments of the Church, which is an argument of their confeſſion, that the Commandments of the Church are not God's Commandments.

In this interim the Council of *Trent* ‡, at the before recited place, maketh no difference between Traditions; avouching, that they are all received with like affection of piety and reverence as the holy Scripture, and equalleth thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Traditions (brought in by the Popes at ſeveral times) to the Ten Commandments of the divine Law, and to the Doctrine of the Goſpel written in the New Teſtament.

The ſame Cardinal diſputing againſt *Barkley* touching the Pope's power to depoſe Kings, and cauſe them to be killed, as alſo concerning his authority over all the temporality of the world, not finding either in Scripture, or in antient Hiſtory of the Church, any paſſage or example to countenance and underprop ſo abominable a doctrine, defendeth himſelf in this manner: ‘ || He judgeth not rightly of ‘ the Church, who admitteth nothing but what he ‘ expreſly readeth to have been practiſed or done in ‘ the antient Church, as if the Church of theſe latter ‘ times had ceaſed to be a Church, or had not power ‘ to unfold and declare, yea to eſtabliſh and ordain ‘ the things that appertain to faith and manners of ‘ Chriſtians. This power then of the Pope over the life and crown of Kings is not a divine Tradition, nor Apoſtolick, but Eccleſiaſtical, brought in by the Church of *Rome*, in latter times, that is to ſay, by the Pope.

---

‡ Seſſion 4.

|| Bellarmin in Barkl. cap. 3. Non recte de Eccleſia ſentit, qui nihil admittit niſi quod expreſſe in veteri Eccleſia ſumptum aut factum eſſe legit, quaſi Eccleſia poſterioris temporis aut deſierit eſſe Eccleſia, aut facultate non habeat explicandi, conſtituendi etiam & jubendi quæ ad fidem & mores Chriſtianos pertinent.

And

And when our adverſaries attribute to the Pope the power of adding to the Creed, and of making articles of Faith, it is apparent that they hold the Pope able to bring in Traditions eſſential to Chriſtian Faith, which the Apoſtles have neither written nor taught by word of mouth.

This is that which *Thomas Aquinas* teacheth, in the ſecond part of his Sums, ſaying, ‘ * It belongeth ‘ ſolely to the authority of the ſovereign Pope, to ‘ make a new edition of Creed, as alſo all things that ‘ concern the univerſal Church. Upon which paſſage *Andradius* that aſſiſted at the Council of *Trent*, ſpoke thus in the ſecond book of the defence of the *Tridentine* Faith, ‘ † The *Roman* Pontificks in defining ‘ many things which had been formerly hidden, have ‘ accuſtomed to augment the Creed.

This queſtion hath been moved to the Council of *Florence*, between the *Greeks* and *Latins*; the *Latins* maintaining againſt the *Greeks*, that the Pope and Church of *Rome* may add to the Creed. Finally, in the laſt Seſſion is concluded in favour of the *Latins* ‡, ‘ that the Church of *Rome* hath right of power to add ‘ to the Creed,’ and in the margin is noted, *Rom. Pontificis Poteſtas*, the power of the Pope, for by the Church you muſt underſtand the Pope.

To this doth the Jeſuit *Vaſques* agree, who diſputing of the Apoſtles Commandment, that biddeth the People of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 11. ver. 28. to eat of this bread and drink of this cup, ſpeaking thus, ‘ ‖ though

---

* Ad ſolam authoritatem ſummi Pontificis pertinet nova editio ſymboli, ſicut & alia omnia quæ pertinent ad totam Eccleſiam.

† Romanos Pontifices multa definiendo quæ ante. latitabant ſymbolum fidei augere conſueviſſe.

‡ Ipſi neceſſitate urgente, jure ſuo particulam illam *ex filioque* ſymbolo apponere licuiſſe.

‖ Vazques Tom. 2. Diſp. 216. Num. 60 Licet concederemus hoc fuiſſe Apoſtolorum præceptum, nihilominus Eccleſia & ſummus Pontifex potuerunt illud juſtis de cauſis abrogare. Neque enim major fuit poteſtas Apoſtolorum quam Eccleſiæ & Pontificis inferendis præceptis.

‘ we

'we ſhould grant that it hath been the Apoſtles 'Commandment, yet nevertheleſs, the Church and 'the ſovereign Pope were able to aboliſh this Com-'mandment upon juſt reaſons; for the power of the 'Apoſtles to give Commandments, hath not been 'greater than that of the Church and the Pope.' Seeing therefore that the Pope hath as much power over the Church as the Apoſtles, and that the Apoſtles have had the power to form a Creed, and to eſtabliſh in the Church articles of Faith, which had not been written before, nor taught by word of mouth in the Church; it follows that the Pope hath the ſame power, and that he can form a Creed, or add to that which the Apoſtles have formed, and can ordain matters which the Apoſtles have neither written nor taught by mouth.

Whereupon *Leo* X. in his Bull *Exurge*, which is annexed to the end of the laſt *Lateran* Council, thundereth and pronounceth an anathema againſt *Luther*, for having ſpoken amongſt other things, '* that it is no 'way in the power of the Church, or of the Pope to 'eſtabliſh articles of Faith.

Salmeron the Jeſuit is expreſs in his 13 tom. and the third part of the ſixth diſputation, ſaying, '† The 'Doctrine of Faith ſuffereth addition in the things 'that are eſſential.' Theſe words are worth obſervation, for if you believe this Jeſuit, the Pope and Church of *Rome* may add to the Traditions that are called Apoſtolical, and to the unwritten word, not only matters accidental, but alſo eſſential, not taught by the Apoſtles. Which likewiſe doth infer, that the Apoſtles have not taught all that is neceſſary to Chriſtian Religion, and that then there wanted ſomething that was eſſential in the Doctrine of the Apoſtles.

---

* Certum eſt in manu Eccleſiæ aut Papæ prorſus non eſſe ſtatuere articulos fidei.

† Diſp. 6. §. *eſt ergo*, Doctrina fidei admittit additionem in eſſentialibus.

The

The ſame Jeſuit in his eighth Diſputation, gives a reaſon why the Apoſtles have not written nor preached all things; ‘ * The affairs, ſaith he, in the Apoſtle's ‘ time did not ſo hit and fall out, as that all things ‘ could be decided; and the Church at that time was ‘ of a condition differing from her now preſent eſtate, ‘ and from her eſtate ſince that very time. Moreover, ‘ our nature cannot apprehend all things at once, ‘ but by progreſs and ſucceſſion of time, neither is it ‘ capable of all truths at a time, *&c.* It were then ‘ to abuſe the Holy Ghoſt (that anointeth Chriſt's ‘ members with ointment, and that operateth until ‘ this inſtant) to reject all that hath not been ſpoken ‘ by the Apoſtles.' Whereupon he concludeth, ‘ therefore may there be new traditions concerning ‘ faith and manners, though they were never made or ‘ explicated by the Apoſtles.

Now I leave to judge with what conſcience it may be maintained, that the Traditions are antient and Apoſtolical, ſeeing that our adverſaries do confeſs, that there are many of them modern and new, whereof the Apoſtles never ſpoke a word.

And to the end that no man may conceive theſe new Traditions to be ſpungy and of no weight, unneceſſary, or uneſſential to Chriſtian Religion, he ſpeaks directly, that the new Traditions are touching faith and manners, and that the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith receiveth yet an addition even in things that are eſſential; yea and more expreſly in the ſame eighth Diſputation. ‘ † Hence, ſaith he, may be collected,

---

* §. Atque hoc &c. Nec ſub Apoſtolis omnia occurrunt, ut poſſent ab eis omnia decidi. Et in alio ſtatu erat Eccleſia ſub Apoſtolis quam ſit modo vel fuerit poſt illa tempora. Deinde natura noſtra non omnia ſimul doceri poteſt, &c. In injuriam igitur ſpiritus ſancti qui ungit unctione membra Chriſti, et qui uſque modo operatur, rejicitur quicquid non eſt dudum ab Apoſtolis, &c. Poſſunt ergo eſſe novæ traditiones ad fidem & mores ſpectantes, licet ab Apoſtolis non ſint conditæ aut explicatæ.

† § Tertio. varia. Hinc colligi poteſt non omnia tradita eſſe ab Apoſtolis, ſed ea quæ tunc temporis neceſſaria et quæ ad ſalutem credentium idonea erant.

‘ that

'that the Apoſtles have not given all by Tradition, 'but only the things that then were neceſſary, and 'that were proper for the believer's ſalvation.' According to this Jeſuit's *Tenet*, the Apoſtles have not taught all that is neceſſary in theſe our days; and there are now articles of faith neceſſary to ſalvation, which in the Apoſtles time were not neceſſary.

Of the number of theſe new Traditions neither written nor preached by the Apoſtles, and that are now decreed for neceſſary and eſſential to Religion, are *Romiſh* Indulgences, and Treaſure of the Church, wherein the Pope gathereth up the ſuperabundance of ſatisfactions made by Saints and Monks, and diſtributes them to others by his pardons, to ſatisfy the juſtice of God. This is an eſſential Doctrine of the *Romiſh* Religion, and the arch or buttreſs that ſhoreth up Papiſm. For is there any thing of more importance in Religion, than the remiſſion of ſins, and the means to ſatisfy the juſtice of God? yet in this while our adverſaries do confeſs that this is a new Doctrine, and that there is found no trace or footſtep of it in all antiquity, as we ſhall hereafter diſcover.

When we produce the Council of *Laodicea*, and multitudes of Fathers, *Meliton*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Epiphanius*, *Hierom*, *Gregory*, *Naziauzen*, *Hilary*, *Ruffin*, &c. that unanimouſly exclude the books of *Maccabees*, out of the liſt of canonical books; our adverſaries anſwer that then the apprehenſions and opinions were much differing, for that the Church had not yet decided any thing upon this point. Here then by their own confeſſion is a Tradition which the Apoſtles never taught, nor decided either by mouth or writing, to wit, that theſe Books of *Maccabees* are canonical, which they do now falſely inſert amongſt the Apoſtolical Traditions.

In this claſs I rank Invocation of Saints, adoration of Reliques and Images, the painted Trinity, the power of the Pope to diſpenſe with oaths and vows; to diſpoſe of Kingdoms, and depoſe Kings, to canonize Saints; to releaſe diſtreſſed ſouls out of Purgatory, the Communion under one kind, the *Limbus* for

little Infants, private Maſſes, particular men's prayers, and publick ſervice in an unknown tongue; the aſſumption of the Virgin *Mary* bodily into Heaven, together with her coronation in the dignity of Queen of Heaven, and Lady of the world, and many other the like things, wherein at this preſent they make God's Service to conſiſt; of theſe is the body of Papiſtry compoſed, and herein are the people more carefully inſtructed and exerciſed, than in the doctrine of Salvation contained in the holy Scripture. All which are new Traditions and unheard of in the antient Church; yea and that by the confeſſion of our adverſaries, as we ſhall prove in fit place.

It would be very proper and convenient, to know when the Chriſtian Doctrine ſhall be perfect, and whether the Popes ſhall ever be able to add new articles of faith thereunto.

And if it be ſo that the Apoſtles have neither taught by mouth or writing, all the Doctrines eſſentially belonging to Chriſtian Faith, it would be neceſſary to underſtand whether the Apoſtles knew the Doctrines which they have not taught; for if they knew them, why did they not publickly teach them? Why have they diſſembled Doctrines eſſentially belonging to Religion? But if they knew them not, it muſt be acknowledged, that the Popes ſurpaſs the Apoſtles in knowledge, and that Saint *Paul* deceives himſelf, when he delivereth that he had taught the *Epheſians* all the Council of God, *Acts* 2. ver. 27.

CHAP. VI. *A proof of the ſame, becauſe our adverſaries do affirm that the Pope and the Church of* Rome *may change that which God commandeth in the Scriptures, and infringe or nullify the Apoſtles Commandments.*

WHoſoever teacheth things contrary to the Apoſtles, conſequently teacheth things that are differing and repugnant. The Traditions whereby the ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles is changed and abrogated, cannot be Apoſtolical Traditions, unleſs

leſs we would have the Apoſtles to be contrary to themſelves. Seeing then the Pope and Church of *Rome*, attribute to themſelves the power of altering the Apoſtles ordinances by their Traditions, it followeth that they make traditions which the Apoſtles never taught either by mouth or writing. This is that which is practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, and that our adverſaries do openly maintain.

We have already heard the Jeſuit *Vaſques* ſpeaking, 'that * the Church and ſovereign Pontif, may aboliſh 'and break the Apoſtle's Commandment, becauſe the 'Apoſtles power to give precepts hath not been grea-'ter than the Pope's.

The Council of *Trent*, in the 21ſt Seſſion, Chap 1. and 2. declareth, 'that † this power hath the Church 'always had in miniſtring of the Sacraments, (ſaving 'their ſubſtance) to ordain or alter that which ſhe 'judged moſt expedient for the utility of thoſe that 'receive them.' This Council indeed ſpecifieth that exception, *their ſubſtance remaining ſafe*; but the Pope aſſumeth power to himſelf to judge, and define in the authority of a Judge, what things in Sacraments are eſſential, or whether they be ſo or no. By this means he boundeth his power with what limits he pleaſeth, and changeth matters eſſential into matters accidental. As for example, it is eſſential to the Sacrament of the holy Supper to be a ſignificative ſign of our participation of the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt: This ſignification is diminiſhed to the people, by the privation of the Cup, as Cardinal *Perron* ‡ ingenuouſly acknowledgeth. It is eſſential to the Sacrament to be taken for the remiſſion of ſins, as it was firſt inſtituted

---

* Vaſques Tom. 3. diſp. 216. Num. 60.

† Præterea declarat hanc poteſtatem perpetuo in Eccleſia fuiſſe, ut in Sacramentorum diſpenſatione, ſalva illorum ſubſtantia, ea ſtatueret vel mutaret quæ ſuſcipientium utilitati magis expedire judicaret,

‡ *Perron* againſt the King of Great Britain, in his Treatiſe of the Communion under both kinds, p. 1108.

by the Lord: Now this eſſence is changed in the Maſſes that are ſaid for the Corn, for Horſes and diſeaſed Sheep, for the ſucceſs of a voyage, &c. It is likewiſe eſſential to the holy Supper, to be a communion, as the Apoſtle telleth us, 1 *Corinth.* 10. 'The bread 'which we break, is it not the Communion with the 'body of Chriſt? for as much as we that are many 'in number are one bread and one body.' This Communion is aboliſhed in private Maſſes, where no Man doth communicate, where no man doth aſſiſt. And theſe words of the inſtitution, *Take, Eat,* are become ridiculous, ſince no man is there either to take or eat. The real and propitiatory Sacrifice of Chriſt's body, is it not of the eſſence of the Maſs? yet is there an addition to the Lord's Inſtitution, wherein is neither mention made of ſacrifice, or of ſacrificing his Body, or of making any oblation to God. The Pope then in the Sacraments changeth eſſential things as well as accidental. And by the way obſerve but the pride of this Council, and deteſtable impiety, to be of opinion that the Church of *Rome* knoweth better than Jeſus Chriſt, what is expedient for the People's Salvation.

Doth not the Council of *Conſtance*, in the thirteenth Seſſion confeſs, that ‖ in the primitive Church, (and conſequently in that of the Apoſtles) this Sacrament is to be received by the faithful under both kinds? yet afterwards forbad the cup to be given to the People. This Tradition which a little while ſince hath changed the Apoſtles obſervation, cannot be an Apoſtolical Tradition.

The Gloſs upon the Canon *Lector*, in the four and thirtieth diſtinction of the *Romiſh* decree, ſaith, that *Papa diſpenſat contra Apoſtolum*, the Pope diſpenſeth againſt the Apoſtle.

‖ Licet in Primitiva Eccleſia hujuſmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus ſub utraque ſpecie, &c.

Pope

Pope *Innocent* the third ſaith in like manner, * *We may according to the fulneſs of our power diſpoſe of the Law, and diſpenſe above the Law.* And moreover the Gloſs of the Doctors addeth: *For the Pope diſpenſeth againſt the Apoſtle and againſt the old Teſtament, as alſo in the vows and oaths.* And the Gloſs of the Canon *Sunt quidam* in the 1. queſtion of the 25. cauſe: *Papa diſpenſat in Evangelio interpretando ipſum,* the Pope diſpenſeth in the Goſpel in giving it interpretation.

In the firſt book of *Gregory*, the ninth decretal, at the 7 title, Chap. the 3. we have an Epiſtle of *Innocent* the 3. where he ſpeaketh thus: † *Thoſe which the Biſhop of* Rome *doth ſeparate, it is not a man that ſeparateth them but God. For the Pope holdeth place on earth, not ſimply of a man but of true God.* Which the Gloſs explaineth by the example of Jeſus Chriſt, who is very God and very man; informing us likewiſe that the Pope though he be very God yet leaveth not to be ſomething the ſame that man is. In proſecution whereof the ſame Gloſs declareth how far forth the Pope's power doth extend, which is, *That he hath celeſtial government, and therefore may change the nature of things, applying the ſubſtance of the one to the other, of nothing can create ſomething: And a decree that is void, he can make it in force; for in matters that he will have come to paſs, his will is his reaſon; and no man queſtioneth him wherefore do you*

---

* Innocent 3. Decret. De conceſſ. præbend. tit. 8. cap. Propoſuit. Secundum plenitudinem poteſtatis de jure ſupra jus poſſumus diſpenſare.

† Cap. Quantò perſonam. Non enim homo, ſed Deus ſeparat, quos Romanus Pontifex (qui non puri hominis, ſed veri Dei vicem gerit in terri) Eccleſiarum neceſſitate penſata diſſolvit. In quæ verba Gloſſa ſic habet: Etiam aliquid eſt ſecundum quod homo, tit. de hæret. cum Chriſtus. Et eſt verus Deus & verus homo; gerens veri Dei vicem. Unde dicitur habere cœleſte arbitrium. Etiam naturam rerum immutat, ſubſtantialia unius rei applicando alij: Et de nullo poteſt aliquid facere. Et ſententiam quæ nulla eſt poteſt facere aliquam. Quia in his quæ vult, ei eſt pro ratione voluntas. Nec eſt qui ei dicat: cur ita facis? ipſe enim poteſt ſupra jus diſpenſare. Idem de injuſtitia poteſt facere juſtitiam.

that? For he can diſpenſe above the Law; and of injuſtice can make juſtice; and proveth all this by multitudes of Canons and Decrees.

Cardinal *Bellarmin* ſpeaks as much in the 31 Chapter againſt *Barkley*: ‡ *In good ſenſe and judgment Chriſt hath given to Peter (and conſequently to the Pope) the power of making that to be ſin which is no ſin, and that which is no ſin to be ſin.* It is no wonder then if by the ſame power he can make juſtice to be injuſtice, and ſin to be no ſin, that he can nullify the Apoſtles ordinances, and make them unjuſt, as alſo cancel the old Traditions, and eſtabliſh new. The ſame Cardinal proceedeth ſo far as to ſay: * *If the Pope erred in commanding vices and forbidding virtues, yet the Church ſhould be obliged to believe that the vices are good and the virtues evil, unleſs it would ſin againſt the conſcience.*

Andradius in his ſecond book of the defence of the Tridentive faith acknowledgeth that † *His anceſtors, men excelling in piety have broken and annulled many Decrees of the Apoſtles.* And moreover pronounceth this ſentence: *It is evident that thoſe have not erred who ſay that the Romiſh Pontiffs can ſometimes diſpenſe with obeying the Law of the Apoſtle St.* Paul, *and the fewer firſt Councils.*

Whereupon Cardinal *Tolet* in his firſt book of Sacerdotal inſtitution, Chap. 68, giveth this reaſon: ‖ 'For 'all that the Apoſtles have inſtituted, is not ordained

---

‡ In bono ſenſu dedit Chriſtus Petro poteſtatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, & de non peccato peccatum.

* Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 5. Si Papa erraret in præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere vitia eſſe bona & virtutes malas, niſi vellet contra conſcientiam peccare.

† Minime vero majores noſtri religione & pietate excellentes, Apoſtolorum hæc & quamplurima alia decreta refigere in animum induxiſſent, niſi intellexiſſent, &c. Liquet eos minime erraſſe qui dicunt Rom. Pontif. poſſe nonnunquam in legibus diſpenſare à Paulo, & primis 4 Conciliis.

‖ Cum certum ſit non omnia quæ Apoſtoli inſtituerunt jure divino eſſe inſtituta.

'*jure*

'*jure divino*,' that is to ſay, it ought not to be held for the word of God. Now amongſt the Apoſtles ordinances, to diſcern ſuch as are *jure divino* from thoſe as are not, the Church of *Rome* hath no other rule but the Pope's will and pleaſure, who can make a commandment of the Apoſtle to be or not to be held for the word of God. This venerable Cardinal giveth us the Apoſtle's commandment for an Example, 1 *Timoth.* 3. *Let the Biſhop be huſband of one wife.* For the Pope can admit and allow of bigamies to the Prieſthood.

Cardinal *Perron*, in his book againſt the King of Great *Britain*, makes a Chapter expreſly to that purpoſe, entitled: ‡ 'Of the authority of the Church to 'alter matters contained in the Scripture:' And in the ſame book in the Chapter that handleth the Communion under both kinds, he ſaith, that † 'when in 'the form of the Sacraments ſome great inconvenien-'cies are met withal, the Church may therein diſpenſe 'and alter.' And ſpeaking of the Lord's Commandment, *Drink ye all of it*, he maintaineth 'that this pre-'cept was not immutable nor indiſpenſable, *alledging* 'that the Church hath judged that there may be diſ-'penſation for it.

Charles Bovius in his obſervations upon the 24 Chap. of the 7 Book of the Apoſtles conſtitutions, ſaith that '§ The Church of Rome challenging to herſelf Apoſ-'tolical authority, can change and alter every thing 'to better, according to the condition of the 'times', yet there complaineth that a cuſtom of the antient Church to faſt on Wedneſdays, and many other very good Laws were aboliſhed.

---

‡ Lib. 2. Obſervat. 3. cap. 3. pag. 674.

† Pag. 1109. & 1115.

§ Eccleſia Romana quæ Apoſtolica utens poteſtate, ſingula pro conditione temporum in melius mutat. Quartæ feriæ jejunium quod diu manſit in Eccleſia, nunc (quod eſt dolendum atque lugendum) cum aliis optimis majorum inſtitutis, in deſuetudinem abiit.

Gregory of *Valence*, in the fourth Tome of his Commentaries, and the ſixth Diſputation, maketh no difficulty to affirm that § 'Many things in theſe latter 'times are better ordained in the Church than they 'were in the beginning,' that is to ſay, from the Apoſtles time.

The ſacred Scripture in the 18, and 20, of *Leviticus* layeth down certain degrees of conſanguinity and alliance which hinder marriage, whereof the moſt removed is the marriage of the Uncle with the Niece, or the Aunt with the Nephew; which are marriages forbidden and declared inceſtuous by the word of God, which permitteth marriages in other degrees more removed. But the † Pope uſurpeth power to himſelf in giving liberty to marriages forbidden in the Scripture, yea extending ſo far as to a toleration of marrying two ſiſters, as alſo he permitteth the Uncle to marry the Niece. On the otherſide he forbiddeth marriages in more remote degrees, and which God permitteth in his holy word; as marriages between the iſſues of couſin-germans and between couſin germans removed. Whereupon the Council of *Trent* in the 24 Seſſion at the 3 Canon denounceth an *Anathema* againſt all thoſe that ſhall ſay, that the Church of *Rome* cannot forbid marriage in degrees allowed by the word of God, and cannot diſpenſe in degrees forbidden. Thus runneth the Canon: '‡ If 'any man ſaith that there are no more degrees of con'ſanguinity and alliance, than what are expreſſed in *Le*'*viticus*, that can hinder from contracting of marriage, 'or ſeparate that which is contracted, and that the

§ Gregor. de Valen. Tom. 4. diſp. 6. qu. 8. puncto 5. ſect. 10. Et certè quædam poſterioribus temporibus rectius conſtituta eſſe in Eccleſia quam initio ſe haberent. Id confirmat authoritate Ambroſii, & Thomæ Waldenſis Tomo 2. de Sacrament. cap. 94.

† De la permiſſion d'eſpouſer les 2. ſœurs, voyez Almain au li. de la puiſſance Eccl. & laique.

‡ Si quis dixerit eos tantum conſanguinitatis et affinitatis gradus qui Levitico exprimuntur, poſſe impedire matrimonium contrahendum, & dirimere contractum, nec poſſe Eccleſia in nonnull's illorum diſpenſare aut conſtituere ut plures impediant & dirimant, Anathema ſit.

'Church

'Church cannot dispence in some of these degrees, nor 'ordain that many other degrees hinder or separate the 'marriage, let him be an Anathema'. This Council curseth those which say, that the Church of *Rome* cannot alter God's ordinance, nor dispense with that which God hath forbidden in his holy Word. It is true that in the same Session this Council giveth an exception in these words: * 'Let no dispensation be given in 'the second degree, unless between great Princes and 'for publick cause. For the laws of the Church of *Rome* open or shut according to the quality and riches of the Persons. Now it were good to know whether to marry a wives sister, or his niece, or cousen; a dispensation were ever asked of St. *Peter*, and whether he gave dispensation to the rich and sent the poor away.

According to this power that the Pope arrogateth to himself to dispense against God's commandment contained in the Scriptures, he dispenseth with persons concerning their oaths and vows; he dispenseth with subjects and officers of a King, for keeping the fidelity sworn to their Sovereign Prince. He separateth marriages lawfully contracted, under the shadow of Religion, against the Lord's commandment, speaking of the dissolution of marriages, *Matth.* 19. 6. *What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder:* For the same that *Tolet* speaketh of the Apostles, may be spoken of Jesus Christ, '† that 'all that he hath instituted is not *Jure divino*.' He exempteth children from obedience to their parents, contrary to the Law of God, when they are cast into Monasteries against the wills of their fathers and mothers. He suffereth whoredom, yea in *Rome* it self, and there establisheth Brothel-houses against the Law of God. He hath forbidden the publick service in a known tongue, appointed Masses without Communi-

* In secundo gradu nunquam dispensetur nisi inter magnos Principes et ob publicam causam.

† Lib. 1, instit. Sacerd. c. 68.

cants, and ordained Image-ſervice againſt the expreſs commandments of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Apoſtle St. *Paul:* and againſt the practiſe of the primitive Church, yea againſt the very Law of God, as we will ſhew in fit place.

Theſe things and many more the like do explain, that the queſtion between us and our adverſaries, is not alone, whether the Apoſtles have taught *Traditions* by mouth, which they would not have to be ſet down in writing, and whether beſides the Scripture, there ought alſo Apoſtolical *Traditions* to be received. For the principal point of difference is touching the *Traditions* which our Adverſaries confeſs not to have been written nor taught by the mouth of the Apoſtles, and which have been long ſince introduced. And touching the Pope's power to add to the Creed, and to eſtabliſh new articles of faith. Yea eſpecially and above all, touching an arrogance without example, wherein the Pope and Church of *Rome* attribute to themſelves the power of annulling God's commandments, and of the Apoſtles contained in holy Scriptures, and to alter the inſtitution of our Lord, and to judge, (as Cardinal *Perron* ſpeaketh) that ſuch and ſuch commandments of our Lord are diſpenſable. Theſe kind of *Traditions* ought to be called after the Italian word *Tradimenti*, treaſons or conſpiracies againſt God.

CHAP. VII. *Paſſages extracted out of the Writings of our Adverſaries, which prove that in the Church of* Rome, Traditions *are without compariſon more eſteemed and reſpected then the holy Scripture and the Scripture reviled and charged with injuries. Jeſuit* Regourds *boldneſs to blemiſh and defame the Scripture.*

THE Council of Trent in the fourth Seſſion, ſeemeth contented to equal *Tradition* with the Scripture, ordaining that the one and the other be received and honoured with like affection of piety and reverence. But this Council doth now, (as cuſtomarily

rily it doth) propoſe its doctrine in doubtful terms, involving it ſelf in drakneſs and obſcurity. For whoſoever is never ſo little verſed in the writings of our adverſaries, or hath exactly conſidered the practiſe and cuſtoms of the Romiſh Church, ſhall eaſily diſcover that the holy Scripture is of no compariſon with the value and account of *Tradition*, which is exalted with praiſes and magnifical titles, as alſo moſt carefully obſerved, whilſt the Scripture is rejected and made odious to the people as a dangerous book.

I. We have ſeen in the former Chapter, how our adverſaries affirm openly, that the Pope and Church of *Rome* can alter the Lord's Inſtitution, and nullify his Ordinance: The which being granted, it neceſſarily followeth, that the *Tradition* of the Church which correcteth the holy Scripture, and altereth what is therein ordained, be of greater authority than the Scripture.

II. When our adverſaries unanimouſly affirm that the Scripture is not Judge, but that the authority of judging belongeth to the Church; hereby they withdraw us from the Scriptures Judgment to rely upon the Church's *Tradition:* for by the *Tradition* of the Church they only underſtand the Laws of the Church of *Rome*, by the which they would have us judged.

III. † When they ſay that the Scripture is not the rule of our faith, but that it is the faith of the Church that ruleth the Scripture, they manifeſtly prefer *Tradition* of the Church before Scripture: For the faith of the Church, and *Tradition* of the Church are all one.

IV. Theſe goodly Maxims, wherewith they dull our ears; § 'That the Church ought to have more 'authority over us then the Scripture, That it is the

† Stapleton lib. 2. de authoritate Scripturæ. cap. 11. Dixi et dico, non tam ipſius fidei regulam in ſe eſſe ſcripturam, quam ipſam ſcripturarum regulam eſſe fidem Eccleſiæ.

§ Charron. an 2. chap. de la troiſieme verite. Nous voulons l'egliſe avoir pour noſtre regard plus d'authorite que l'eſcriture.

'Church

'Church which giveth authority to the Scriptures; 'and that the authority of the Scripture over us is 'founded upon the authority of the Church:' What are their meaning other than that the Scripture oweth that authority ſhe hath, to the *Tradition* of the Church? For the *Tradition* of the Church is nothing elſe but the voice and judgment of the Church, whereby ſhe pronounceth as being a ſovereign and infallible Judge, that the Scripture ought to be received.

V. ‡ If the Scripture muſt be believed, becauſe the *Tradition* of the Church ſo ordained it, what followeth, but that *Tradition* of the Church of *Rome* is more credible then the Scripture?

VI. The Jeſuit *Coſter* in his *Enchiridion*, Chap. 1. calleth the doctrine imprinted in the heart of the Church another *ſpecies* or kind of Scripture, and compareth it alſo with holy Scriptures. ‖ 'The excellence *(ſaith he)* of this kind of Scripture ſurpaſſeth much the holy Scriptures which the Apoſtles 'have left us in parchment, eſpecially becauſe this is 'written with the finger of God, the other was written with the Apoſtles pens,' By his leave I would willingly aſk him whether the Apoſtles pens were not guided by the ſpirit of God.

VII. *Carranza* in the ſecond Controverſy: * 'The 'Church is a rule, that is elder and more known, yea 'much more ample then the Canonical Scripture, and 'this ought to be governed by that, but not on the 'contrary.' In ſaying that the Church is a rule, it is evident, that by the Church he underſtandeth the

‡ Staplet. lib. 1. de authorit. Scripturæ. c. 9. Ipſis Prophetis è medio ſublatis, eorum prophetias à Deo eſſe credendum non eſt niſi id Eccleſia confirmet. Synodus Romana ſub. Gregor. 7. Quod nullus liber Canonicus habeatur ſine authoritate Papæ.

‖ Hujus Scripturæ præſtantia multis partibus ſuperat ſcripturas quas nobis in membranis Apoſtoli reliquerunt. Primum quod illa exarata ſit digito dei, hæc calamis Apoſtolorum.

* Nos dicimus quod priore regula et notior et multa latior eſt Eccleſia quam Scriptura canonica, et hæc ab illa debet regulari, & non è contra.

Tradition

Tradition and laws of the Church: For the perſons are not the rule.

VIII. *Bellarmin* in his fourth Book of the Word of God, chap. 6. * 'There are Traditions that are greater than ſome Scriptures, in point of obligation.'

IX. *Salmeron* in his firſt Prolegomenon: '† Though 'the authority as well of the Church as of the Scripture be of God, yet the authority of the Church is 'more ancient, yea and more worthy; for the Scripture is made for the Church.' By the ſame reaſon one might ſay, tha tſubjects have more authority than Laws and Kings: for the people are more ancient than Laws and Kings, and Laws and Kings are made becauſe of the people.

Now, the authority of the Church of *Rome* cannot be promoted above the Scripture, but that by the ſame reaſon the authority of Tradition in the Church of *Rome* is to be advanced above the Scripture: for Tradition is the law of the Church of *Rome*.

X. '*Cordubenſis* ‡ To decide controverſies of 'the Faith, Tradition of the Catholick Church is the 'moſt certain Rule.

XI. We have formerly heard *Coſter* and *Salmeron* the Jeſuits ſpeaking, that God would not have Traditions that are taught out of the Apoſtles mouths to be written, for fear leſt holy things ſhould be given to dogs. Herein do they not clearly ſignify that the Scriptures are for the dogs, but that God would not have Traditions to be in ſuch danger, as being more ſanctified things, and worthy of greater reſpect.

XII. To what end do theſe men ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt hath commanded the Apoſtles to preach, and

---

* Quædam ſunt Traditiones majores quod ad obligationem, quam quædam Scripturæ.

† *Nunc de.* Nam etſi Eccleſiæ ac Scripturæ authoritas à Deo ſit, illa tamen Eccleſiæ antiquior eſt, atq; adeo dignior, ſiquidem Scriptura propter Eccleſiam contexta eſt.

‡ Cordub. Art. 3. cap. 80. Catholicæ Eccleſiæ Traditio eſt certiſſima regula.

not

not to write, but that unwritten Tradition might be preferred before the Scripture, and have much more authority.

XIII. Did it ever happen that any of our adverſaries have reported the ſame of Traditions which they have ſaid of Scripture? Have they ever called the Traditions a dumb rule, a part or parcel of a rule, an ambidexter ſword, a ſtone of ſcandal, a noſe of wax? have they ever accuſed *Traditions* of obſcurity, of ambiguity, or of imperfection, as they have the Scripture?

XIV. But the Jeſuit *Salmeron* ſhall ſuffice for all: for in the third part of his 13 Tome, and 8 Diſputation, he treateth of this matter punctually and at large, and thus compareth Scripture with Tradition: *'Tradition (ſaith he) is above all things neceſſary to ſalvation, yea higher than Scripture itſelf.' And a little after: 'The Scripture rather recommendeth Tradition than Tradition the Scripture; and therefore Tradition is more neceſſary, for Scripture is made to recommend Tradition to us.' And there again:' Tradition is neceſſary, becauſe of many doubts that are not contained, nor expreſly defined in the Scriptures.' And again, †'He that believeth not the Tradition received in the Church, but ſearcheth the Scripture, reſembleth an ill debtor, who refuſeth to pay unleſs he ſee a quittance, or the bond, when as to produce fit witneſſes would be enough.' Which is as much as to ſay, that the people may permit and baulk the Scripture, but muſt cling cloſe to the Teſtimony and Tradition of the Church of *Rome*.

---

* §. *Eſt igitur.* Traditio eſt imprimis ad ſalutem Eccleſiæ neceſſaria. *Ibidem.* Potius ergo Scriptura commendat traditionem, quam traditio ſcripturam: et ob id magis eſt neceſſaria, quia ad eam commendandam eſt Scriptura. Neceſſaria eſt Traditio ad multa dubia quæ expreſſe in Scripturis non continentur nec definiuntur.

† §. *Poſtrema. Ibidem.* Qui non credit traditioni in eccleſia recepta, ſed quærit ſcripturam malo debitori ſimilis eſt, nolenti debitum reddere ſi non oſtendatur ſyngrapha, cum ſatis ſit idoneos producere teſtes.

He

He further alledgeth, * 'Tradition is more ancient 'than Scripture;' † whence he inferreth, that it is more excellent than Scripture; and ſaith again, that the ſame which recommendeth the Traditions above Scripture, 'is their clearneſs and evidence: for the 'people have no knowledge of the Scripture: and 'the Scripture may be wreſted by the Heretiques to 'whatſoever they will.' He addeth likewiſe, ‡ 'that 'the Scripture hath not been able to judge of doubts, 'becauſe it is difficult and dumb; and that he that is 'troubled with any doubt in the new Teſtament is ſent 'to the Church, *Acts* 15. but not to the Scriptures, 'which like a waxen noſe are moulded and twiſted 'at pleaſure. Whereupon (ſaith he) ‖ thoſe that will be 'perverſe cannot be vanquiſhed by the Scriptures, their 'throats then muſt be cut by Tradition alone.' And further, '** That Tradition is more firm than Scrip-'ture, it appeareth in this, that the Church and the 'ſanctity of the Apoſtles is more known than Scrip-'ture, becauſe this is known by that.' Wherein he ſpeaketh againſt common ſenſe; for it is by the Scripture that we learn the ſanctity of the Apoſtles: and we know not that God will have but one Church in the world, if he did not teach it us in the Scriptures.

Again, he dareth to ſay, 'that ‡‡ the Scriptures 'are true, becauſe they are conformable to the Tra-

---

* §. *Secunda.* Secunda conditio traditionis eſt quod ſit Scriptura antiquior.

† §. *Tertia.* Tertia conditio quæ traditionem commendat, eſt claritas & perſpicuitas. Nam primum Scripturas turba non cognoſcit.

‡ §. *Deinde.* Scriptura poteſt ab hæreticis trahi ad quod ſibi quiſq; collibuerit.

‖ §. *Tertia quia.* Scriptura dubiorum quæ pullulabant index eſſe non poterat, &c. tum quia ſcriptura difficilis eſt, tum quia muta eſt, &c. Hinc in novo Teſtamento ad Eccleſiam mittitur qui aliquo dubio torquetur, ut conſtat, Act. 15. non autem ad Scripturas quæ inſtar vaſi cerei ducuntur quo quis vult, &c. Ideo protervire volentes, Scripturis non poſſunt refelli, una ergo traditione jugulandi ſunt. ** §. *Quod autem* Quod hæc ſit firmior inde conſtare poteſt, quia notior eſt Eccleſia et Apoſtolorum ſanctitas, quam ſcripturæ, cum hæc per illam cognoſcatur. ‡‡ *Ibidem.* Scripturæ veræ probantur, quia ſunt conformes traditioni jam factæ.

'dition

* dition already made.' Will we know if the unwritten word of God in two Tables ought to be received? will we know if the doctrine contained in the Pſalms of *David*, in the Prophets, and in the Evangeliſts be true? let us enquire what the Pope's opinion is, and what Tradition of the *Romiſh* Church is, and we ſhall ſoon be ſatisfied: for, (ſay our adverſaries) the Scripture muſt be examined by the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*, which is the rule of Scripture, and is not ruled by the Scripture. Truly theſe things cannot be read without horror and deteſtation.

Of the ſelf ſame Stuff is that which he addeth: * 'The Apoſtles have not written by one common conſent, but ſome have written for particular reſpects, and to preſerve Tradition.' When you hear theſe kind of people ſpeak, you would ſay that the Scripture is nothing but a letter of credence, to give authority to the Church of *Rome*, and her Traditions.

Wherefore he concludeth, that † 'no man ought to depart from the Church, inſtructed by living Traditions, notwithſtanding the allegations of Scripture.

He compareth alſo the amplitude and large extent of Tradition, with the narrow limits of the ſcripture: 'Tradition ‡ (ſaith he) is much more univerſal than Scripture, and reacheth to further time, to more matter, and more perſons than the Scripture.' To be ſhort, if theſe men were to be believed, Tradition comprehendeth all the Doctrine of faith and manners, but many things are wanting in the Scripture.

Having in this manner diſhonoured the Scripture, and placed it far below Tradition, he makes them

---

* Apoſtoli non ſcripſerunt omnes, quaſi ex communi conſenſu partito labore, ſed tantum aliqui pro cauſa particulari, et ad conſervandum traditionem.

† *Ibidem.* Ideo non recedendum eſt ab Eccleſia, viva traditione erudita, vel ob ſcripturas allegatas.

‡ § *Quinto.* Traditio multo eſt univerſalior, quam Scriptura, quia ad plura tempora, ad plura objecta, et ad plura individua ſe extendit.

fight,

fight, and plotteth to have the allegations of Scripture to be repulſed by Tradition. † 'To thoſe (ſaith he) 'who demand the Scripture, Tradition is to be of-'fered in oppoſition:' as if he ſhould tell us: 'You 'aſk me paſſages of Scripture, but content yourſelf 'that I alledge unto you Tradition, and the opinion 'of the Church of *Rome*. For this is the more ne-'ceſſary rule, more ancient, more firm, more eaſy, 'more univerſal, and by which the truth of the Scrip-'ture ought to be examined.' Thus is the Word of God handled; and it is ſo come to paſs, that the ſame Jeſuit in his tenth Diſputation * having ſaid, that 'the Scripture cannot be Judge, addeth, that 'the 'Heretiques (for ſo he qualifies us) have a diabolical 'ſenſe, and do worſe to addict themſelves to the Scrip-'ture, than to apply themſelves to fables.'

But nothing doth more plainly ſhew, with what a loud voice our adverſaries cry up the tradition of the Church of *Rome* above the Scripture, than when they ſay, that the Church is not ſubject nor bound to the Scripture, but the Scripture is ſubject to the Church, that is to ſay, God is ſubject to men. For our adverſaries acknowledge, that the Scripture is the Word of *God*. § Theſe are the words of *Lindanus* in his Panoplia: 'The Church hath not been obliged to the 'Scriptures by Chriſt's will and commandment.'

Coſter the Jeſuit in his 3 chapter of his Manual: ‖ 'Chriſt was not willing that his Church ſhould depend 'upon Scriptures in paper, nor was he pleaſed to com-'mit his myſteries to parchment.'

---

† §. *Alias*. Petenti ſcripturam opponenda eſt Traditio.

* §. *Quarto cum*. Cum Scriptura obſcura ſit valde, nec index eſſe queat, &c ——Proprium ergo et diabolicum ſenſum habent, ideireo pejus eſt illis, vacare Scripturis quam fabulis.

§ Lindan. Panopl. in indice titulorum lib. 5. cap. 5. Eccleſiam non eſſe ex voluntate Chriſti ſcripturis allegatam.

‖ Chriſtus nec Eccleſiam ſuam à chartaceis ſcriptis pendere, nec membranis myſteria ſua committere voluit.

Salmeron

Salmeron in his ſecond Prolegomenon: * 'In the 'Church of God (underſtanding always the *Romiſh*) is 'the holy ſpirit, which is Author of the Scripture: 'it is no marvel then if the Scripture be ſubject to the 'Church that hath the ſpirit.' What? is not the Pope ſubject to the Scripture? is he not ſubject to the Law of God, which God hath given us written in two Tables? Is he not obliged to obey the Doctrine of the Goſpel written in the New Teſtament? Now if the head of the Church of *Rome* be ſubject to the Scripture, how much more the Church of *Rome*, that is ſubject to the Pope? But is it not a tranſcendent blaſphemy to defend, that the Scripture is ſubject to the Church of *Rome*? For is not the holy Scripture the Word of God? It muſt otherwiſe follow, that the Word of God is ſubject to men, and that God's commandments are ſubordinate to the Pope, to whom the Church of *Rome* is ſubject. Now tell me after ſuch abomination, whether theſe men do believe that there is one God, and one Religion.

Thomas Stapleton an Engliſh Doctor, in his ſecond Book of the authority of the Scripture, chap. 11. ‡ 'I have ſaid, and do ſay, that the Scripture in itſelf 'is not the rule of faith, but the faith of the Church 'is the rule of Scripture.' Now the faith of the Church is nothing but Tradition of the Church. His ſcope then is, that the Scripture ſhall be regulated and examined by the Tradition of the *Romiſh* Church, and that it ſhall be ſubject to that rule; whence is to be concluded, that God ſpeaking to us in the holy Scriptures is directed by men, and ſubject to their Judgment. The Prophets whoſe writings are extant with us, were extraordinarily ſtirred up to reprehend the Church of that time, and to chaſtiſe the Prieſts, the Sacrificers, and the Scribes that erred in manners and doctrine.

---

* §. *Septimo Scriptura.* Addimus in Eccleſia Dei eſſe Spritum ſanctum Scripturæ authorem. Non mirum ergo ſi Eccleſia Dei, quæ Spiritum habet, ſubjiciatur.

‡ Dixi et dico, non tam ipſius fidei regulam in ſe eſſe ſcripturam, quam ipſarum ſcripturarum regulam eſſe fidem Eccleſiæ.

Now

Now in reaſon tell me, were the prophecies of theſe Prophets ſubject to the authority of that Church? Was the faith of theſe Sacrificers a rule, by which thoſe divine Prophecies were to be examined, and which we have kept to this preſent time? Go to then, if the prophecies were not ſubject to Prieſts and Sacrificers, that lived about the Prophets time, how are they now ſubject to the Pope? by what occaſion are they become ſubject to the ſuperintendency of the Church of *Rome*'s Tradition?

Briefly, we are now arrived at an age wherein blaſphemy is come to the higheſt degree, men openly profeſſing, to pull God with violence from his Throne, and moſt inſolently to climb above him. Surely the Mahometans do ſpeak of the Scripture with more reſpect and reverence.

What is the ſcope or purpoſe of Jeſuit *Regourd*'s late book, intitled *Catholick demonſtrations*, but to prove, that to reſt upon the Scripture, is the way to all impiety and atheiſm? If herein he meant only our *French* Bibles, or the diverſity of *Latin* tranſlations, or the ſundry interpretations which he diſcovereth in ſome of our Doctors, (though all this which he ſaith are but calumnies, and a Fardel of unprofitable trifles, which we have refuted in a former treatiſe) yet this were to forge untruths with Method, and ſcarce to touch upon the queſtion: but he meaneth the originals, *Hebrew* and *Greek*, wherein he findeth no certainty. * 'He 'diſcovereth in them manifeſt contradictions, and 'error in the calculation of times. ‡ He ſays that St. *Paul* 'uſed Fraud (but an honeſt fraud) towards the *Corin-* 'thians. § He telleth us that many books of the Scrip- 'ture are loſt, that the Scriptures were burnt in time 'of perſecution, and the Copies periſhed: that ‖ many 'devout Doctors do affirm, that under the captivity 'of *Babylon*, all the old Teſtament was depraved, 'rent in pieces, and burnt, until *Eſdras* did newly

* Pag. 440. ‡ Pag. 562. § Pag. 128. & 131. ‖ Pag. 131. 'recom-

'recompoſe the ſame Scriptures: * that the *Jews* (our 'Saviour's enemies) have made vowels in the old Teſ-'tament, and ſo changed the ſenſe of the Scripture, 'and made it doubtful. The ſame (ſaith he) is true 'of the new Teſtament, the which having been writ-'ten without accents, and without marks and diſtinc-'tions of words, no man can aſſure himſelf of the 'true ſenſe, ſeeing that the ſenſe dependeth upon the 'accents, *&c.*' And a little further: 'We have not 'therefore any true knowledge of the ſenſe of the 'Scripture, and conſequently we are pointed and re-'ferred over to the mercy of the conteſtations of 'Grammarians, to the litigious craft of critical Spirits, 'to the capricious fancies of Dictionary-makers, to 'the Gallimafries and Chimeras of ſcholiaſts.' Now for all theſe difficulties, there is but one ſingle remedy, to wit, we muſt repair to the Church, that is to ſay, the Pope, and whom it ſhall be his pleaſure to authoriſe. Whereupon it were good to know, when there is a queſtion concerning the expoſition of an *Hebrew* or *Greek* paſſage, whether a Pope, who underſtands neither *Hebrew* nor *Greek* ſhall therein be a good Interpreter: whether ſitting in the Apoſtolick chair, he ſhall give infallible interpretations of a Text whereof he knoweth not a letter: whether having called the Doctors to inſtruct him thereupon, he inſtantly reinveſteth them with an infallible ſpirit, and enableth them with power not to err in matters, wherein he himſelf underſtandeth nothing. Whence then proceedeth ſo great a diverſity and contrariety amongſt theſe Doctors in the Scriptures interpretation? why amongſt their writings do they refute the interpretations of one the other? Is it not the Pope and the Church of *Rome* that by the Council of *Trent* hath authoriſed the vulgar latin Tranſlation, and ordained that it ſhould only be received for authentical, although it be the worſt interpretation of all; and ſtuffed with a thouſand errors and abſurdities? have not the Popes themſelves ſince

* Pag. 183.

the

the Council of *Trent* cauſed multitudes of faults to be amended therein? do not the moſt learned of the *Romiſh* Church, *Pagnin*, *Arias Montanus*, *Iſidorus Clarius*, *Andradius*, *Sixtus Senenſis* complain of the corruption of this tranſlation? wherein the Jeſuits themſelves are not ſilent, eſpecialiy * *Salmeron* in his ninth *Prolegomenon*: of theſe things we have written at large in our firſt Treatiſe *of the Judge of controverſies.*

The perverſeneſs of this Jeſuitical ſpark is moſt of all diſcovered herein, that having once diſplayed (as he ſuppoſeth) the defaults of the Scripture, he rejoyceth that ſuch defaults are therein found, and giveth God thanks for it; to the end that men finding no ſteadineſs or certainty in the Scripture, may ſubject themſelves to the tyranny of the Church, that is to ſay, of the Pope, and there to find inſtruction, theſe are his words: § 'The providence of God to conſtrain 'us yet more powerfully to undergo the yoke of the 'Church with humility and ſimplicity, permitteth 'that there be not only ſome alteration in certain par-'cels of the Scripture, and in ſome copy, but the 'more the books of the Scripture are diſperſed, the 'more they ſhall alter and periſh by tract of time, 'whether they be in original tongues or tranſlations.' Without doubt, he that rejoyceth at the depravations which he imagineth to be in Scripture, and at the loſs of ſome books, and praiſeth therein the providence of God, would much more ſolace himſelf and rejoyce if all the Scripture were aboliſhed For to what purpoſe ſerveth it, if Tradition of the Church of *Rome* be a perfect rule, more certain, and of more authority than the Holy Scripture; and if the Pope judge ſovereignly and infallibly of all the points of faith? for he hath forbidden the people to read the Scripture, as a book not only unneceſſary, but alſo dangerous, and

---

* Salm. Prol. 9. Quinqua. 1. Can 5. In novo Teſtamento ſequenda eſt editio vulgata ac tenenda corrigenda tamen, & Emaculanda prius in his in quibus aut temporum injuria aut, labrariorum incuria vel imperitia depravata eſt.

§ Demonſtr. 2. § 5. p. 128.

that

that which hath made a great breach in the Popedom.

The ſame Jeſuit pleaſeth himſelf with this conceit of his, inculcating it with often repetion; *As in the third demonſtration*, when he hath ſaid, that a man cannot aſſure himſelf of the ſenſe of the Greek Teſtament, becauſe it firſt was written without accents and diſtinctions (whereon depends the ſenſe,) he addeth: 'It is 'a work of the providence of God, to ſtoop our minds 'and inclinations to the ſovereignty of the Church,' that is to ſay, of the Pope, who by conſequence, hath more authority than the Apoſtle S. *Paul* ſpeaking to the *Corinthians*, *not that we have dominion over your faith*, 2. *Cor.* 1. 24. But may not we affirm it with more probability, to be a work of God's providence, that he hath ſuffered ſo many ſchiſms and hereſies, ſo much ſimony, uncleanneſs of life and cruelty to have infected the Seat of *Rome*, whereby to refer us to the Scripture, to make us forſake thoſe wicked guides, and to ſubject us to his holy word? and that God by his providence, hath permitted that the Popes themſelves have confeſſed their own errors? And laſtly, that the Popes ſycophants have recorded unto us their Crimes and Hereſies, as I have proved in my firſt Book.

In ſhort, to be thoroughly informed with what ſpirit this Jeſuit is lead, it is but to read the ſame that he hath written in his third Demonſtration, pag. 190. 'They cauſe them (ſaith he) to renounce the Church '(pretending that it conſiſteth of Men that are faulty 'and lyars) under a fair reſemblance of Scripture, and 'under a plauſible promiſe to govern all by the word 'of God. But the truth is, they depute a blear eyed '*Leah* unto them in lieu of a fair *Rachel*, and ſub'mit faith to the ſovereign command of the will of 'Miniſters, who put into their hand a Scripture that 'is humane, erroneous, mutable, ſubject to correction, '*&c.* This miſerable Jeſuit will one day render an account to God of ſo damnable a ſpeech, wherein he compareth the holy Scripture to blear eyed *Leah*, and the Church of *Rome* to beautiful *Rachel*. It is very

falſe

falſe that we renounce the Church; but yet we maintain that it ought to be ſubject to the Scripture; and we renounce the doctrine of thoſe who ſay, that the Scripture is ſubject to the Church of *Rome:* for God cannot be ſubject to men.

As for the ſovereign power of the Miniſters function, that might well be retorted upon us for a reproach, if we boaſted amongſt us that they cannot err, that they have power to change God's commandments contained in the holy Scriptures, to add to the Creed, and to make new articles of faith; or if we ſhould ſtile ourſelves Judges infallible and ſovereign of the points of faith. We leave theſe uſurpations, and proud titles to the Pope, by the which he exalteth himſelf above God. Only we exhort the people to believe to believe the Word of God contained in holy Scriptures: wherein if we find any obſcure paſſages, we take not upon us to be Judges of the ſenſe, and to determine it with authority. It is enough, that as much as therein is perſpicuous and plain, (not needing the help of an Interpreter) is ſufficient for our ſalvation. And to conteſt much about Tranſlations, we buſy not ourſelves; for the Tranſlation approved by the Church of *Rome* ſufficeth us, diſcovering clearly therein the very condemnation of Papiſtry. All Tranſlations agree in the matters neceſſary to Salvation, and the original Texts both Hebrew and Greek, are at this day familiar and agreeing to our Tranſlation.

Of theſe things have I treated at large in my firſt Book of *The Judge of Controverſies*, and have diſcuſſed all the ſlender objections wherein our Adverſaries do ſide with Pagans and Infidels, and endeavour to extenuate the firmneſs and authority of the Scripture, which Saint *Paul* calleth *The divine Oracles*, Rom. 3. 2. and *The Scripture divinely inſpired*, 1. *Tim.* 3. 16. which I ſay, *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf hath uttered, holding up his own vocation by the Teſtimony of the Prophets, and by it hath repelled the Temptation of the Devil, *Math* 4. Yea *S. Paul* ſaith, that *the Scripture can make a man wiſe to ſalvation, and is moſt proper for man's accompliſhment in every good work*; without it we have

have not means to know that God will have but one Church in the world. And when our adverſaries have wretchedly reviled it, yet are they afterwards conſtrained to return unto it, and to beg of it, (though with an ill ſtomach) ſome clauſes of Text to found their Church upon the Scriptures authority: without it Chriſtianity had been long ſince aboliſhed. The divine efficacy of it is manifeſt in this, that the Pope hath ſuppreſſed it, ſo as the people may not ſee it: yet when God is pleaſed to lay it open to the people's view, and that it be tranſlated into vulgar tongues, Papiſtry doth immediately vaniſh in many Provinces. Yea if Emperors and Kings had not haſtened to ſuccour, uſing both fire and ſword, and the rigour of Inquiſitions, without doubt Papiſtry had been utterly extinguiſhed. Wherefore it is no marvel if the Pope by his ſcouts labour to blemiſh the Scripture, rendering it doubtful and without authority; which ungodly inſtruments at this day borrow the weapons of Pagans, who to reſtore Paganiſm and ruin Chriſtianity, have had no ſurer courſe than to defame the holy Scripture. Lo whither Satan ſtrives to lead us: He ſtrives to ſhake the only foundation of Chriſtian religion, to the end that the people diſtaſting the Scripture, may for their faith and ſalvation rely upon the conductors of the *Romiſh* Church, wherein have lived multitudes of Popes notorious hereticks, and ſo judged by the Councils which the Church of *Rome* hath approved, and by the Popes favourites themſelves: Wherein alſo you may perceive to the number of three and twenty Schiſms, and many contrary Popes at the ſame time, mutually entitling themſelves Antichriſts. Yea wherein have lived many infamous Popes, Necromancers, Adulterers, Murtherers, advanced to the Popedom by whores, by Simony, and by violence. Such as take upon them the title of God, cauſing themſelves to be adored, and kings to kiſs their feet, and the Scripture to be proſtrate before them when they enter into the Councils; ſuch as vaunt they cannot err, that they can make another Creed, can change God's ordinances, can tranſport ſouls out of Purgatory into Paradiſe, and rank whom they

they pleaſe in the Catalogue of Saints by canonizing them: under colour whereof they exerciſe an abominable commerce and traffick by Diſpenſations, Abſolutions, Indulgences, Annates, Licences, and Benefices. So as from a poor Biſhop of a City, who was no way eminent but in martyrdoms, the Pope is become a puiſſant temporal Monarch ſurpaſſing in riches the greateſt Monarchs of the earth. To effect ſo great an alteration, it was needful that Religion ſhould be changed: for the purity and plainneſs of chriſtianity regulated by the Scriptures, could not ſerve to build up ſo great an Empire.

Theſe things have I amply handled in my firſt Book, wherein I maintain the authority of the Scripture. Which work went then forth almoſt the very day that Jeſuit *Regourd*'s Book againſt the Authority and Perfection of the Scripture was publiſhed. Theſe two Books if any man will compare together, ſhall find that I anſwer all that he pleadeth againſt the authority of the Scripture; and that *Regourd*'s Book ſatisfieth nothing at all that I propoſe in mine. Before that he publiſhed his book, a Challenge was brought to the Paſtors of this Church of *Sedan*, to enter into conference and diſpute with ſome Doctors, amongſt who was Jeſuit *Regourd*, wherein they threatned us. We accepted the Conference: the place and day were aſſigned, with all accommodations, that after ſo many Defiances every man's honour ſhould oblige him not to recant. Nevertheleſs he durſt not appear, and for two ſeveral times failed at the day appointed. But his humour ſerving him at laſt to diſpute, and being thirſty of reputation, he went ſome where elſe to diſcharge his choler, and in Conference ſeiſeth upon *Monſieur Meſtrezat*, where he received all ſort of diſgrace, ſo far forth as his friends were fain to make uſe of ſuperior power to draw him from the combat, and to hinder the Conference from Printing, for it could not be ſeen but to his diſhonour: and that in a place where all things were favourable unto him, and where the language of Truth is very new and ſtrange. And ſo retired this witty Doctor, as well contented as ſatisfied, being not ſo

wiſely adviſed but to make trophies and ſigns of victory, conſidering there were ſo many witneſſes.

CHAP. VIII. *A Proof of the ſame by the practice of the Primitive Church.*

WE have proved by many paſſages of our Adverſaries, that in the Church of *Rome*, Traditions are much more eſteemed, and of greater authority than the Scripture, which they ſo much undervalue, and charge with a thouſand reproaches; and that by injuſtice and moſt fraudulently the Council of *Trent* ſeems to make them equal. Now are we to prove the ſame by the practice and maxims of the Church of *Rome*.

I. In the firſt place, when our adverſaries ground the authority of the Scripture upon tradition of the Church, and would have the Scripture received and believed, becauſe the Church doth ſo ordain it; It is evident that they prefer Tradition before Scripture: for they make Scripture to depend upon Tradition, and eſteem Tradition of the Church more worthy of belief than Scripture, and believe not the Scripture, but becauſe the Church of *Rome* hath ſo commanded it.

II. Let us look upon experience, and we ſhall inform ourſelves, that in the Church of *Rome* the people are a thouſand fold more carefully inſtructed in Tradition, than in the doctrine of ſalvation contained in holy Scriptures. The moſt ignorant know the meaning of Lent, and the four Seaſons: they are inſtructed in the difference of meats; they are ſkilled in Feſtival days and Eves; they go in Pilgrimage, viſit the Reliques, gain Pardons; purchaſe Maſſes, Obits, and Suffrages for the dead; ſpeak of Purgatory, mumble over their Chaplet or Beads, and their Roſary, or our Ladies Pſalter; and diſcourſe of the Pope's ſucceſſion in Saint *Peter*'s Chair, but they are ignorant in the holy Scripture, accounting it modeſty and humility not to enquire much after it. Aſk them upon the doctrine of our Redemption in Jeſus Chriſt, upon Juſti-

Juſtification by faith, upon our free Adoption, upon the correſpondency between the Law and the Goſpel, upon the difference between the old and new Teſtament, upon the cauſes wherefore it was neceſſary that our Redeemer ſhould be God and man in the unity of perſon, upon the ends of their Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, upon the Doctrine of faith and good works (which are the points wherein conſiſteth the eſſence of Chriſtian Religion) and you ſhall find them as mute as fiſhes, and altogether uninſtructed.

III. Baptiſm is a divine Inſtitution; but Confirmation (ſuch as is practiſed in the Church of *Rome*) and confection of the Criſome, are human Inventions. Yet are they much more honoured than Baptiſm: for in the Church of *Rome* a woman, yea a Pagan and Jew may baptize, and give that which they have not: and Confirmation is not adminiſtred, nor Criſome conſecrated but by the Biſhop with great ſolemnity.

IV. God hath commanded St *Peter*, and the other Apoſtles to preach the Goſpel, but gave them no command to give Indulgences, nor to canonize Saints, nor to releaſe ſouls out of Purgatory, nor to conſecrate their *Agnus Dei*, and their *bleſſed Beads*. The firſt point is a commandment of God, the other things are human Traditions, which the Pope doth perform with preparation and ſolemnity: but he preacheth not the Goſpel, eſteeming the labour of preaching as a thing unworthy of his greatneſs. Inſomuch as the Popes are induſtrious obſervers of their own Traditions, and adore their own proper Inventions, but diſpenſe with the Lord's commandments.

V. Hence cometh it to paſs, that the ſins committed againſt God's Law, are held to be light, in compariſon of thoſe committed againſt the Traditions, Decrees, and Canons of the Pontifics. The inferior Prieſts give abſolution of theft, of lying, and of whoredome, which are ſins againſt the Law of God; but there are caſes reſerved, wherein no man in *France* can give abſolution but at the point of death, and they are ſpecified in the Bull *De Cœna Domini*, which the Pope thundereth every year on Monday and Thurſday before

the Paſchal. The ſins that are moſt enormous, and whereof no man but the Pope maketh abſolution, are not murther, parricide, inceſt, ſodomy, and perjury: but to appeal from the Pope to a future Council, to withdraw Tythes from the Clergy, to take up Arms with hereticks, to impeach thoſe that go to *Rome* to obtain the great Pardons, to play the Pyrate upon the coaſts of the Papal territory from the hill *Argentara* to *Terracina*; of theſe heinous ſins none but the Pope can give abſolution; for theſe are trangreſſions againſt the Laws and Traditions, broached by the Popes for their profit, and to infringe them is rated a matter more grievous and capital than ſins againſt the Law of God contained in holy Scriptures.

VI. The Canon *Violatores*, in the 25. Cauſe, and 1. Queſtion, pronounceth, that * *thoſe blaſpheme againſt the holy Ghoſt who violate the ſacred Canons.* Whence it followeth that this ſin is unpardonable. The ſins then againſt the Law of God are remittable, and the Prieſts forgive them; but to violate the Canons of the Church of *Rome*, is a ſin unabſolvable. This is that which is ſpoken by Pope *Nicholas* the firſt † 'If any 'one ſin againſt the Decretals of the Apoſtolique Set, 'let him know that it ſhall not be forgiven him,' at the Canon *Si Romanorum*, in the 19. Diſtinction. And there again he declareth that § 'the Old and New Teſ-'tament ought to be received, although they be not 'inſerted in the Canons, for the holy Pope *Innocent* 'hath expreſſed his opinion touching the ſame.' If the Old and New Teſtament muſt be received, becauſe Pope *Innocent* hath ſo appointed it, we muſt conclude that the Decree of Pope *Innocent*, is of more authority than the Old and New Teſtament. For that which giveth authority, is greater than that which receiveth it. Yet

---

* In Spiritum ſanctum blaſphemant qui ſacros Canones violant.

† Can. Si Romanorum. Diſt. 19. Ut ſi quis in illa commiſſerit, noverit ſibi veniam denegari.

§ Capitulum S. Innocentii Papæ, cujus authoritate doceatur, a nobis utrumque teſtamentum eſſe recipendum, quamvis in ipſis paternis Canonibus nullum eorum ex toto contineatur inſertum, &c.

the

the Old and New Teſtament had their plenary authority before Pope *Innocent* was in the world.

VII. Pope *Gregory* the firſt, before *Nicholas* had beat the path to this pride, in his Epiſtle to *Antonine Subdeacon*, complaineth of one *Honorat*, * 'who (ſaith 'he) hath not only neglected the commandments of 'God, but alſo miſpriſed our writings:' as if his writings were of more authority than the commandments of God.

VIII. ‡ 'The ſingle life of Prieſts is a mere human 'Inſtitution,' as *Thomas* acknowledgeth; as alſo *Bellarmin* in his book concerning the Clergy, Chap. 18. And in very deed the Scripture ſpeaketh nothing thereupon. But whoredom is forbidden by the Law of God; nevertheleſs if a Prieſt doth play the Fornicator or Adulterer, it is but a laughing matter: But if a Prieſt do marry to obey the Apoſtle, ſpeaking: *If they cannot contain let them marry*, 1 Cor. 7. 9. *And let a Biſhop be a huſband but of one wife*, 1 Tim. 2. 2. this marriage is called a ſacrilege, and pointed at as a prodigious thing. In luſt and whoring he tranſgreſſeth the Law of God, and the vow that he hath made to obey his word. In marrying he tranſgreſſeth the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*, and the vow invented by human Tradition, which is accounted the greater offence. For it hath pleaſed the Pope to allow of obſcene whoredom, and to forbid marriage, which are two Traditions that have carried him away againſt the rules of holy Scripture.

IX. Mark yet ſomething worſe †. Pope *Innocent* the third declareth, that 'a Prieſt having many Concu-

* Lib 2. Epiſt. 16. Non ſolum mandata Dei negligens, ſed & ſcripta noſtra contemnens.

‡ Thom. 2. ſecundæ. quæſt. 88. art. 11.

† Innoc. 5. Extra de Bigamis, cap. Quia circa. Poſtulaſti per ſedem Apoſtolicam edoceri ſi preſbyteri plures Concubinas habentes bigami cenſeantur. Ad quod duximus reſpondendum, quod cum irregularitatem non incurrerint, cum eis tanquam ſimplici fornicatione notatis, poteris diſpenſare. Navar. Tom. 2. cap. Ad inferendam. 23 quæſt. 3. De defenſione proximi cap. 37. ſect. 15. Reſpon-

' bines. is not therefore lapſed into irregularity, that ' is to ſay, doth not for this become incapable to ex- ' erciſe the Prieſthood.' Yea for Sodomy a Prieſt is not degraded, as is taught by *Navarras* the Pope's Penancer. But a Prieſt that marrieth, is forthwith degraded, is made a publick execration, and chaſed with more maledictions than the Azazel or Scapegoat, although he have the Apoſtle on his ſide, to protect him againſt the Tradition.

It is certain that in the Church of *Rome*, to eat fleſh on Goodfriday, is accounted an hundred degrees more horrible than to haunt brothel houſes: and to break the arm of an Image, is more than to break the heads of ten living men. For Tradition is more religiouſly obſerved than the Law of God.

CHAP. IX. *Three reaſons wherefore Tradition is preferred before the Scripture in the Church of* Rome.

THE reaſons that have moved the Pope to exalt Tradition above the Scripture are three. 1. The one is, becauſe the ſucceſſion of the Pope in the primacy of St. *Peter* is a Tradition, which is the only prop of his dominion. And therefore it nearly concerns him to exalt Tradition, upon which his Empire is founded.

2. The ſecond is, becauſe Traditions depend upon the Pope, and as he contrived them, ſo can he alter them. But he hath not the Scripture in his power; he cannot make another holy Scripture, nor change the Hebrew original which the Jews (who are not obedient to him) do carefully preſerve; nor the Greek Teſtament, which the Greek Churches have ſaved for us. It concerns him therefore that the Traditions (whereof

---

Reſpondendum eſt crimen Sodomiæ non comprehendi [in criminibus quæ irregularitatem inducunt] &c. Quia parum refert illud crimen eſſe graviſſimum et ſpurciſſimum, cum majus ſit crimen hæreſis mentalis, & odium Dei, quorum tamen nullum irregularitatem inducit.

he

he is both maker and Maſter) be had in great eſtimation.

3. The third is, becauſe all Traditions are gainful to the Pope and Clergy, and ſerve to extol the Papal Empire, and dignity of the Eccleſiaſticks: he and his Clergy rake up infinite profit by Indulgences, private Maſſes, Suffrages and Maſſes for the deceaſed, Diſpenſations, Annates, &c. By confeſſions the Prieſts know the ſecrets of families, and make themſelves formidable, in reſerving the participation of the Chalice to themſelves and Kings, they make themſelves companions of Kings, and worſhipful to the People: by Tranſubſtantiation * 'they attribute to themſelves the pow-'er of making God with words, to create their Crea-'tor, and to have Jeſus Chriſt within their juriſdicti-'on, locked up in a Pix'. By the ſacrifice of Maſs, they make themſelves ſacrificing Prieſts, ſacrificing Jeſus Chriſt to his Father. By the inſtitution of feſtival days, the Pope uſurpeth power in commanding all ſhops to be ſhut up, and cauſeth all Seſſions of juſtice and Council to be interrupted at his pleaſure. By the difference of meats, he governeth the Markets, Kitchens, and Tables of Kings. By the canonization of Saints, he makes his meaneſt grooms to be worſhipped by the People, and lifteth up to heaven thoſe that have moſt faithfully ſerved him; and commandeth the people to invoke ſuch Saints as he pleaſeth. By the Sacrament of Penance, he impoſeth corporal and pecuniary penalties and mulcts, yea upon Kings and Princes to the very whipping of them, uſurpeth ſway over bodies and goods, and changeth corporal puniſhments into pecuniary. By the Abſolution of ſins, the Prieſts make themſelves Judges between God and the ſinner, and will have God obliged to pardon a ſinner, becauſe the Prieſt hath pardoned him; yea in a cauſe where God is the party offended, the Prieſt maketh himſelf judge.

---

* Gabriel Biel in Can. Miſſ. Lect. 15 Non voluit Dominus aliquem habere poteſtatem ligandi vel ſolvendi ſuper corpus Chriſti myſticum, niſi haberet poteſtatem ſuper corpus Chriſti verum.

Whereas God in the holy Scripture giveth to Paſtors power to diſpenſe with the puniſhment of ſins as far as Eccleſiaſtical cenſure, theſe gallants make bold as far as the Conſcience, and to the very judicial ſeat of God. By ſervice in Latin, the Pope retaineth the People in ignorance, and planteth among all Nations a mark of his Empire, giving them the Roman language to ſubdue them to the Romiſh Religion. The Diſpenſations which the Pope giveth to Princes, to marry in degrees forbidden by the word of God, do oblige the Children that ſpring from them to maintain the Papal authority; for if that were ſhaken, it would be doubted whether they be legitimate or no. The power of diſ-enthroning Kings, diſpoſing of Empires, cauſing their feet to be kiſſed by Monarchs, canonizing Saints, and of releaſing ſouls out of Purgatory, are Traditions which magnify the papal dignity, above all power ſpiritual or temporal that ever was on earth. Wherefore let us not marvel that the Pope laboureth to countenance theſe Traditions, and to cruſh the Scripture, which doth but moleſt him, diſaccommodate him in his traffique, and ſtaggereth his whole Empire.

Hereupon the Reader that hath heard the compariſon, which our Adverſaries make of Tradition of the Romiſh Church, with the holy Scriptures (ſaying, that Tradition of the Church is more antient, more ample, more clear, more certain, and of more authority over us than the holy Scripture) will call to remembrance the example of the Ægyptians, who paſſing by long ranks of columns and pillars and by magnifical Temples, did lead the Worſhippers to a place more ſolitary and retired, where ſtood the God of the Temple; there did they ſhew them an Ape, or an Ox, or a Cat, in honour of whom the Temple was erected even thus do our Adverſaries in this queſtion. After ſuch high titles and magnifications of Traditions (to the extolling of them above the word of God, contained in holy Scriptures) when we come

to

to unmaſk their uglineſs, and offer them to ſight, they preſent us with abſurd inventions, and ſuch as expoſe Chriſtian religion to laughter. They tell us of Images of the Trinity in wood or ſtone. Of ſouls that broil in a fire for ſins pardoned. Of Indulgences for one hundred years. Of priviledged Altars, upon which whoſoever cauſeth a Maſs to be ſaid, maketh choice of a ſoul to be releaſed out of Purgatory. Of Adoration of Images, bones and rags. Of ſolitary Maſſes without communicants, which chant after the intention of him that pays them. Of publick prayers and particular in an unknown tongue. Of Maſſes for Horſes. Of Jeſus Chriſt carried away by mice. Of bleſſed beads, and *Agnus Dei*. Of Pilgrimages. of the difference of meats. Of borrowed ſatisfactions. Of faſting and being whipt one for another. Behold their Traditions, ſee what is preferred before the Scripture, obſerve the Laws and documents which they ballance with the Law that God himſelf hath pronounced, and with the doctrine of our redemption, which the eternal Son of God hath brought from Heaven, and yet is found light in compariſon of theſe venerable Traditions; for why? becauſe they caſt into the ſcale a maſſy ſtone, to wit, the names of *Pope* and *Church of Rome*, which in the hearts of Men grown brutiſh, weigh down againſt God and the Scriptures.

CHAP. X. *That in this queſtion, by the word Church, our Adverſaries underſtand not the Church whereof is ſpoken in the Creed, but the Pope alone.*

FOraſmuch as our Adverſaries do maintain, that the Church whereof mention is made in the Creed, is the whole body of the faithful people, and that to this people it belongeth not to be judge of doubts and controverſies, it is evident that by this Church (which is ſaid to be ſovereign judge and infallible) another Church is underſtood, beſides that

whereof mention is made in the Creed; but as by the Church they underſtand only the Church of *Rome*, ſo by the Church of *Rome*, is underſtood the Pope, who attributeth this ſovereign and infallible authority to himſelf. Thus do the Doctors accord, and in this manner do apprehend it.

Salmeron the Jeſuit; * 'ſeeing that the Scripture is 'very obſcure and difficult, and cannot be judge (for 'ſo the providence of God ſhould be annihilated, be-'cauſe by it alone the controverſies moved cannot be 'appeaſed and determined) it remaineth therefore, that 'ſome certain judge deſigned was left unto us. And 'he is thought to be no other than the ſame that ever 'was, to wit, the Biſhop of *Rome*; for otherwiſe the 'Providence of God in ſo many ages had periſhed.'

Cardinal *Cajetan*: † 'It is moſt true that the au-'thority of the univerſal Church and of Council, re-'ſideth principally and totally in the Pope, to deter-'mine the points of Faith.' And there again he ſaith, that 'the Church adoreth the Pope.'

Paſchal the Pope avoucheth, that the Church of *Rome* is not ſubject to Councils, and that in whatſoever they ordain, the Pope is always excepted. Speaking thus ‖ 'They ſay that this is not found to 'be decreed in the Councils.' To the which he maketh this anſwer: 'as if any Councils had preſcribed

---

* Salm. Tom. 13. parte 3. diſp. 10. ſect. quarto cùm. Cum Scriptura obſcura ſit & perdifficilis nec judex eſſe queat: quia providentia Dei tolleretur, cum per eam ſolam lites obortæ ſedari non poſſint; ſupereſt ergo ut certum aliquem iudicem nobis deſignatum reliquerint. At hic alius non eſt habitus quam qui ſemper fuit, hoc eſt, Rom. Epiſcopus: alias enim periiſſet providentia Dei per tot ſecula.

† Cajetan. in 2æ q 1. art. 10. Veriſſimum eſt authoritatem Eccleſiæ univerſam et Concilij principaliter et totaliter reſidere in Papa, in determinando ea quæ ſunt de fide.

‖ Extr. de Electione. cap. Significaſti. Tit. 6. Aiunt hoc in Conciliis ſtatutum non inveniri. *Reſp.* Quaſi Romanæ Eccleſiæ Concilia ulla legem præfixerint. Cum omnia Concilia per Romanæ Eccleſiæ authoritatem facta ſint, & robur acceperint, et in eorum ſtatutis Rom. Pontificis patenter excipiatur auctoritas.

'any

'any law to the Church of *Rome*, when as all the 'Councils have been made, and have taken their force 'by the authority of the Church of *Rome*; and in their 'ſtatutes the authority of the Pope is clearly excepted.' Who doth not perceive that in theſe words, by the Church of *Rome* the Pope alone is underſtood? for our Adverſaries deny not, but that the People and Clergy of the Church of *Rome*, are ſubject to the Councils.

The Jeſuit *Gregory* of *Valence* in the title of the ſeventh book of his Analyſis: § 'The Pope of *Rome* 'is he in whom reſideth all authority of the Church, 'to judge entirely of all doubts of the Faith.

Andradius in his firſt book of the defence of the Tridentine faith ‡ 'Our faith conſiſteth in the faith of the 'Pope, and upon his authority alone dependeth all 'men's ſalvation.' Judge whether man's ſalvation be not well derived. Whereupon he ſpeaks there again, that * 'the authority of the Pope to decide all contro-'verſies, is not leſs than the authority of the whole 'Church.' And we have formerly heard the Jeſuit *Vaſques* affirming, that the authority of the Pope is not leſs than that of the Apoſtles, and that he can abrogate and cancel the Apoſtles commandments. In the ſecond Seſſion of the laſt Lateran Council, theſe words are expreſſed' † Behold Julius the Succeſſor 'of St. Peter, no leſs in authority than him.' It is true that when the Pope will, he joineth ſome Prelates with him, to aſſiſt him in his decreeing. But whereas he calls and chuſeth whom he will, theſe Prelates have not authority but by him, and the

§ Pontifex ipſe Romanus eſt in quo authoritas illa reſidet: quæ in Eccleſia extat ad judicandum de omnibus omnino controverſiis fidei.

‡ Fide Papæ noſtra continetur, & ex ejus unius authoritate ſalus omnium pendet.

* Non minor eſt Papæ ad controverſias dirimendas quam Eccleſiæ totius authoritas.

† Ecce adeſt Divi Petri ſucceſſor Julius non minor authoritate.

Pope

Pope can enact all without them. This is that which Cardinal *Bellarmin* hath, in his third book of the word of God, Chap. 9. ‘ ‖ That judge cannot be ‘ the Scripture; therefore is it the Eccleſiaſtical Prince, ‘ either alone, or with the advice and approbation of ‘ the brother Biſhops.’

For ſo our Adverſaries do jointly hold, that when the Pope judgeth in the Apoſtolick Chair, and as Pope, his ſole opinion and decree is as firm and certain, as if a Council had voted upon it.

And to remove all doubt, our adverſaries bluſh not openly to affirm, that by this word *Church*, the *Pope* is to be underſtood. *Gregory* of *Valence*, the Jeſuit after having ſaid, that the full authority of judging controverſies of the faith and manners, which concern the univerſal Church, doth plenarily reſide in the Pope of *Rome* Chriſt's Vicar, he addeth: ‘ ‡ Now ‘ therefore when we ſay, that the Propoſition of the ‘ Church is a condition neceſſary, to oblige the ‘ Faith to one agreement, by this word *Church* we ‘ underſtand her head, which is to ſay, the Pope of ‘ *Rome*, either alone, or with the Council. For he is not of opinion that the Council be neceſſarily required.

Bellarmin expoundeth it thus, in his ſecond book of the Councils, Chap. 19. *The Pope* (ſaith he) *ought to ſpeak it to the Church, that is to ſay to himſelf.* And Pope *Innocent* the third, in his Chapter *Novit extra de judiciis*, attributeth to himſelf the taking notice of a difference between *Philip* the ſe-

---

‖ Iſte judex non poteſt eſſe ſcriptura &c. Igitur Princeps Eccleſiaſticus, vel ſolus vel cum conſilio et conſenſu coepiſcoporum.

‡ Grego. de Valent. Tom. 3. in Thom. diſput. Hanc authoritatem plene in Romano Pontifice, &c. reſidere, qui ſcilicet de fidei et morum controverſiis ad univerſalem Eccleſiam pertinentibus, vel per ſe vel cum generali Concilio ſufficienter conſtituat. Jam igitur quum dicimus propoſitionem Eccleſiæ eſſe conditionem neceſſariam ad aſſenſum fidei, nomine Eccleſiæ intelligimus ejus caput, id eſt, Romanum Pontificem per ſe, vel unà cum Concilio.

cond

cond ſurnamed *Auguſtus* King of *France*, and *John* King of *England*, for it is written, *tell it to the Church*. Now St. *Peter* was one of thoſe to whom Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke, *Tell it to the Church:* Was this Apoſtle able to divine that Jeſus Chriſt underſtood, *Tell it to thy ſelf?* and that Jeſus Chriſt would have the party complainant to be judge? ſee then the Church (which is a word that ſignifieth an aſſembly) reduced to one man. And the ſenſe of this Article of the Creed, *I believe the Church* ſhall be, *I believe the Pope*, who ſometimes calls himſelf God, ſometimes Jeſus Chriſt, and ſometimes the Church; ſo he ſhall be Bridegroom and Spouſe; and one man ſhall call himſelf an aſſembly.

And tell me to what purpoſe are Councils aſſembled, ſo long and ſo painful, ſeeing nothing is to be done, but to conſult the Papal Oracle, which in one inſtant can decide all controverſies without poſſibility of erring, ſeeing (I ſay) that in one man we have the univerſal Church, that the Council can do nothing without the Pope, and that the Pope can do all, and judge of all without the Council? Whereupon *Bellarmine* affirmeth with all the Doctors, that * 'the infallibility of a Council is not in the 'aſſembly of the Counſellors, nor in the Council of 'Biſhops, but in the Pope alone;' and yet in the mean time the Popes themſelves appear not in the Councils.

This Advertiſement was very neceſſary, to the end that the Reader might know, that as by the authority of the Church, is underſtood the authority of the Pope; ſo by Traditions of the Church, nothing is underſtood but the ordinances made or approved by the Pope, for they ſubſiſt not but by his authority; and though they have paſſed through a Council, yet the Pope can change and aboliſh them, and inſtitute

* Bellar. lib. 4. de Roman. Pontifice, ca 2. Sect. videntur. Ipſam infallibilitatem non eſſe in cœtu conſiliariorum, vel in concilio Epiſcoporum, ſed in ſolo Pontifice.

new

new in their ſtead, without waiting for a Council; for ſhould he have leſs authority over Traditions than over the holy Scripture, wherein he can alter the ordinances, and Inſtitutions of our Lord? He can diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, ſhould not he be able to diſpenſe againſt a Council, or againſt the cuſtom which hath authoriſed Tradition? It is the ſame *Andradius* expreſly teacheth, in the ſecond book of his defence of the Tridentine Faith: ‘ * Thoſe, ſaith he, err not ‘ who affirm that ſometimes the Popes in their laws ‘ can diſpenſe contrary to that of St. *Paul*, and the ‘ four firſt Councils,’ which are the univerſal Councils moſt ancient, of greateſt authority, and *which † Pope Gregory the firſt equalleth to the four Evangeliſts.* Pope *Gelaſius* ſpeaks the ſame, for in his tom. of the bond of an Anathema, diſputing againſt one of the four firſt Councils to wit, againſt that of *Chalcedon*, where there were ſix hundred and thirty Biſhops, he urgeth thus ‘ ‡ The Apoſtolical Seat alone diſſannulleth that ‘ which a Synodal Aſſembly thought to have uſurped ‘ againſt Order.’ The ſubject of his choler againſt this ſo famous and honourable aſſembly was, for that in this Council is framed a Canon, ordaining that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be equal to the Biſhop of *Rome* in all things, and that he ſhould have the ſame preheminences.

CHAP. XI. *Of what ſort, how weak, and how uncertain the foundations are, whereon Traditions of the* Romiſh *Church are built; and of the three maxims that ſerve for their defence and prop.*

THE Traditions of the Church of *Rome* are of ſo great a number, that a meer Catalogue of

---

* Liquet minime eos erraſſe qui dicunt Romanos Pontifices poſſe nonnunquam in legibus diſpenſare a Paulo et a primis quatuor Conciliis.

† Greg. 1. lib. 1. Epiſt. 24.

‡ Quod refutavit ſedes Apoſtolica habere non potuit firmitatem, & ſola reſcindi quod præter ordinem congregatio. Synodica putaverit uſurpandum.

them

them would furniſh out a large Volume. The whole rabble of them hath theſe three maxims for their foundation.

1. That the Pope is ſucceſſor to St. *Peter*, in the charge of Head of the univerſal Church.

2. Secondly, that the Pope cannot err in the Faith.

3. That the Apoſtles have not ſet down in writing all that they did teach by word of mouth.

He that will comprehend the nature of theſe maxims, ſhall know that they evert the Chriſtian Faith, and conſume all Religion into ſmoke; for if the maxims whereon all Papiſtry is founded, and all the body of *Romiſh* Traditions, be imaginary maxims and purely human, (not to give a worſe phraſe) it is impoſſible that the Religion which is built thereupon can have the leaſt tittle of aſſurance.

1. The firſt maxim that layeth down 'the Pope to 'be Saint Peter's Succeſſor, in the charge of head of 'the univerſal Church,' is deſtitute of all teſtimony of God's word; and our Adverſaries to uphold it, produce nothing but human teſtimonies. Whence it followeth, that it is not an article of the Chriſtian Faith, and that it cannot be believed for a certainty of Faith; for the Chriſtian faith is grounded upon the word of God; 'Faith cometh by hearing, and 'hearing by the word of God, *Rom.* 10. 17.

But the Church of *Rome* giveth this maxim not only for an article of Faith, but alſo for a foundation of all the other articles of Faith, and of the whole Religion. For in the Church of *Rome* the Pope's Authority is planted to be a foundation of the Church, and of all the doctrine of ſalvation, to the very ſubjecting of the Scripture, (that is to ſay, the word of God) to his authority; and to cauſe that the authority of the Scripture depend upon the opinion of the Church of *Rome*; and all this by virtue of that pretended Succeſſion to Saint *Peter*. Briefly, our Adverſaries make all Chriſtian Religion to hang upon this point; as *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth, at the

'entrance

entrance of the Preface in his books of the Pope, ſpeaking thus; ‘ * To ſay in word, when mention is ‘ made of the Pope's Supremacy, the ſum of all ‘ Chriſtianity is at ſtake; for the queſtion is, whe- ‘ ther the Church ought to ſubſiſt any longer, or ‘ whether it muſt be diſſolved and fall.’ Thereunto do all the Controverſies refer, and all the traditions aim at the profit and greatneſs of the Pope; yet the ſame Cardinal at the 12th chapter of the ſecond Book of the Pope, acknowledgeth, ‘ that the Scripture maketh ‘ no mention of the Pope's Succeſſion in the place of ‘ Saint *Peter*, and that this point is not *jure divino*.’ Nevertheleſs he affirmeth that this ſucceſſion, though it be not *jure divino*, leaveth not to appertain to the Catholick faith; in the ſame manner as the Catholick Faith believeth, that Saint *Paul* had a Friar's weed, though that were not *jure divino*, and that God had not commanded any thing to that purpoſe.

Hence it is manifeſt, that all the divine doctrine is founded upon a plain human Tradition, to wit, a Tradition unwritten, ‘ That God hath ordained the ‘ Pope of *Rome* for ſucceſſor in the Primacy of Saint ‘ *Peter*.’ Thus you ſee Tradition grounded upon Tradition, that is, upon itſelf; and this infinite Maſs of Traditions is founded upon a Tradition that is no more *jure divino*, than Saint *Paul*'s weed, whereof never was any divine teſtimony extant.

I will not at this time enter into proofs of the falſity of this matter, which we have handled in divers places, eſpecially in my book that went before, and

---

* Et enim de qua re agitur cum de primatis Pontificis agitur? Breviſſime dicam, de ſumma rei chriſtianæ, id enim quæritur, debeatne Eccleſia diutius conſiſtere, an vero diſſolvi & concidere. Obſervandum eſt tertio, licet forte non ſit de jure divino, Romanum Pontificem ut Romanum Pontificem Petro ſuccedere, tamen id ad fidem Catholicam pertinere. Non enim eſt idem aliquid eſſe de fide, et eſſe de jure divino. Nec enim de jure divino fuit ut Paulus haberet penulam; eſt tamen hoc ipſum de fide, Paulum habuiſſe penulam. Etſi autem Romanum Pontificem ſuccedere Petro non habeatur expreſſe in ſcripturis, &c.

ſhewed

shewed the untruths by abundance of reason and authority drawn from antiquity. I say but this, that the antient Bishops of *Rome* were called Successors of Saint *Peter*, in the Bishoprick only of the City of *Rome*; but not in the Apostleship, nor in the government of the universal Church. Just as the Bishops of *Jerusalem* were called Successors of Saint *James*, and those of *Antioch* of Saint *Peter*, and those of *Ephesus* of Saint *Paul* and of Saint *John*; not in the Apostleship, but in the Bishoprick of the towns, wherein these Apostles had planted the Church. Our Adversaries produce not any example or passage of the antient Church, whereby it may appear, that ever the Bishops of *Rome*, attributed any authority to themselves, over the Churches that are out of the *Roman* Empire.

I say also, that when the Bishop of *Rome* was heretofore Successor of Saint *Peter*, in place of head of the Church, so it was that the heresies which infected this Seat (as our adversaries themselves do confess, and the Popes complain of it) and the Schisms which have rent it, (there having been two Popes at once, sometimes three at the same instant, prosecuting one the other to extremity, and calling one the other Antichrist) did long since break the chain of this Succession. In which Schisms ordinarily the most vicious and most cunning carried it; and he excluded his adversary, who had the favour of those Emperors and Kings, on whom the fortune of war did smile. This continued strain of Succession, not being possibly known, but by the multitude of Histories and Authors, both *Greek* and *Latin* (who very often jar among themselves, so far as not to agree upon the next Successors to Saint *Peter*) it is impossible that the people should know any thing in this Succession, or should have any assurance hereof, but by the testimomony of those, who brag of it and live by it.

Moreover, our Adversaries do confess, that the Pope and Church of *Rome* may err in the question *de facto*. Now these questions, to wit, 'whether 'Saint *Peter* hath left the Bishop of *Rome* Successor

'of

'of his Apoſtleſhip, or of his Supremacy; and whe-
'ther this Succeſſion hath not been interrupted by
'Schiſms and hereſies, are queſtions *de facto*,' and conſequently of the nature of thoſe, wherein our adverſaries hold, that the Church of *Rome* may err. And the proofs which our Adverſaries bring forth are drawn, from books which themſelves convince of falſity, and from ſuch fragments as for the moſt part are ſuppoſitious.

I forbear to cenſure any further the certainty of *Romiſh* Traditions, ſeeing they are all founded upon one maxim, which is, a Tradition human, not upheld by any ordinance of God; a Tradition which is not an article of the Chriſtian Faith, yet at this time is put down for the ground of Faith; a Tradition which is of the nature of thoſe wherein our Adverſaries confeſs, that the Church may err, a Tradition whereof the people can have no certainty nor knowledge, but by books, both *Greek* and *Latin* of infinite length, wherein they underſtand nothing, and by the teſtimony of thoſe eſpecially who propoſe it, that is to ſay, the Popes, who receiving not the Scripture for Judge call themſelves ſupreme Judges and infallible in all controverſies, more eſpecially in that wherein is pleaded their ſucceſſion, and their own proper authority and infallibility.

Now it is an eaſy matter to gueſs, at what the proceedings of the Enemy of our ſalvation do level. Their But and ſcope is to diſtil (as it were) all Religion into a vapour, and to make it depend upon preſuppoſitions, not only vain and uncertain, but alſo falſe and imaginary; as he that ſhould bear up an obeliſk upon a ſmall feſkue. When ſome demand, 'Wherefore is it behoveful to receive Traditions?' the anſwer is, 'becauſe the Pope hath ordained it.' Again, if it be demanded, 'Whence cometh this autho-
'rity of the Pope?' It is anſwered, 'Becauſe Saint
'*Peter* dying hath left the Biſhop of *Rome* Succeſſor of
'his Supremacy, over the Church of the whole
'world.' Moreover, when it is aſked, 'Can you
'produce

'produce any ordinance of God for this ſucceſſion; 'for this point being eſtated by you, for the founda- 'tion of the Church, and of all the Chriſtian faith, 'it is not credible that God hath ordained nothing 'of it?' There they ſtand caught by the noſe, not uttering one ſyllable of the word of God, and do confeſs, that this ſucceſſion is not *jure divino*, nor by the ordinance of God. Only the Popes will be therein believed, and call themſelves ſupreme and abſolute, in a caſe wherein they are ſo much intereſted, and wherein it is diſputed of their ſucceſſion and authority. Thus you may ſee all the *jus divinum* founded upon a point which is not *jure divino*; and all, the divine doctrine founded upon human Tradition, yea upon human Teſtimony, the moſt uncertain of all, for the certainty of the Pope's ſucceſſion is founded upon the Teſtimony and Authority of the Pope himſelf, who is party in this cauſe, and who by this Tradition ruleth and upholdeth his Empire.

Nay, they do worſe, they make not only theſe Traditions, but the very authority of the holy Scripture, to depend upon this Tradition. Let it be demanded, wherefore ought we to believe that God hath created man after his own Image, that he hath given his Law to *Moſes* in two Tables, and that the Son of God hath taken fleſh in the Womb of the bleſſed Virgin, and is dead for us? It is anſwered, that this is to be believed, becauſe it is written in the holy Scripture that God hath inſpired his Prophets and Apoſtles. * Again let it be aſked, wherefore ought the holy Scriptures to be believed, and why are we obliged to put our faith therein? The anſwer is, 'Becauſe the Church of *Rome* hath ſo ordained it, 'which hath this authority by virtue of her ſucceſſion

* Baſilienſis Concilii appendice Eccleſia Romana ſic loquitur: Quod autem verum foret Chriſti Evangelium, quomodo ſcire poſſetis, niſi illud vobis patefeciſſem? Audiſtis nonnullos ex Apoſtolis ſcripſiſſe Evangelia. Sed quoniam quatuor duntaxat approbavi, illa ut Evangelia venerantur, alia reſpuuntur.

'in

'in the Supremacy of Saint *Peter*. But upon this queſtion, have you any Commandment from God; they anſwer, the holy Scripture indeed ſpeaks nothing of it, but the Church of *Rome* is ſupreme Judge and hath more authority over us than the Scripture. Nevertheleſs, in this point it is diſputed of the authority of the Church of *Rome*, wherein it is no reaſonable thing that ſhe ſhould be judge, much leſs to aſſign her ſelf judge above the Scripture.

Do but obſerve what becometh of all Chriſtian Religion in the account of theſe Merchants. Their will is that God ſhould be believed, becauſe men ordained it, and that the divine truth ſhould have no other foundation, than the evidence and authority of lying men, yea ſuch as will be judges in their own cauſe, and who having invented a thouſand Traditions (all tending to their profit) hold them all up by one Tradition alone, which hath no other foundation than their own authority. There is no ſuch pernicious ſtratagem to pervert the Chriſtian Religion, as to confound the things that are certain by uncertain proofs to plead human Tradition for their higheſt and concluding principle, and to order that the Chriſtian Faith ſhould have a maxim that is no article of Faith, and is upheld by no other authority than of thoſe that publiſh it, and ſuch as by this maxim enrich themſelves, and build them up an Empire on the earth; yea all the Churches in the world (except the *Romiſh*) do reject this maxim, and laugh at this ſucceſſion, as a ſtory contradicted by all antiquity, and eſpecially by all the Biſhops of *Rome*; who whilſt the *Roman* Empire was in flouriſhing eſtate, never intermeddled in any affair beyond the limits of that Empire; as I have proved at large in my firſt Treatiſe.

The ſecond maxim is of the ſame nature, and dependeth upon the firſt. Our Adverſaries (to maintain all their Traditions) ſay that 'the Pope cannot err in the 'Faith,' and that likewiſe, by vertue of the ſame ſucceſſion; for they will have the Pope Succeſſor not only of the power of Saint *Peter*, but alſo of his infallibility.

Now

Now if the Pope ſhould be Succeſſor of the Supremacy of Saint *Peter*, it followeth not thereupon that the Pope cannot err; for he that is Succeſſor of the charge of another, is not therefore ſucceſſor of his virtue. The Doctors that have ſucceeded in the Chair of *Moſes*, have often corrupted the Law of *Moſes*, and have cauſed the people to depart out of the way, and to ſtumble at the Law, *Malach.* 2. 8. And the Scribes and Phariſees that were in the Chair of *Moſes*, taught that Jeſus Chriſt was a Seducer. And we have formerly ſeen divers Popes condemned for hereſy and impiety by the Councils, and many Popes complaining of their Predeceſſors hereſies. And ſeeing that our Adverſaries confeſs that there have been multitudes of profane Popes, and of infamous life, it is hard to believe that he which is not Succeſſor of the good life, and of the virtues of Saint *Peter*, can be Succeſſor infallible of his purity in the Faith. For if the wicked doctrine of the Leaders of the Church bring in errors, their ungodly life bringeth in profaneneſs, and Atheiſm; and as the Canon *Si Papa* hath it in the fortieth diſtinction, it caſteth headlong innumerable troops of people into hell, it expoſeth the Chriſtian Religion unto ſcandal, and bringeth errors into the very Faith. It being the cuſtom of lewd Paſtors to change the doctrine, for the better accommodation of their vices, and to make it ſerve their avarice and ambition. Let Saint *Peter* preaching the Goſpel be compared with the Pope that preacheth not at all; Saint *Peter* going on barefoot, with the Pope carried upon Princes ſhoulders; Saint *Peter* not ſuffering *Cornelius* to worſhip him, *Acts* 10. with the Pope expecting himſelf to be adored, and that Kings ſhould kiſs his feet; † Saint *Peter* reprehending *Simon Magus* for holding the gift of God purchaſable with money, *Act.* 8. 20. With the Pope draining ſo much money to himſelf by Abſolutions, Diſpenſations, Indulgences, Annates, Archiepiſcopal robes, &c. Saint *Peter* recommending chaſtity to women, 1 *Pet.* 3.

† Lib. Sacram. ceremon. ſect. 5. c. 1 & 3.

With

With the Pope ſuffering whoredom, and eſtabliſhing brothel-houſes publickly at *Rome*; Saint *Peter* that was married, *Mark* 1. 30. with the Pope forbidding the Clergy to live in a State of Matrimony; Saint *Peter* who in his ſecond Epiſtle, Chap. 1. exhorteth the faithful to be attentive to the word of the Prophets, with the Pope not allowing the reading of Scripture; Saint *Peter* writing to all the faithful, and commanding them to obey their Kings, 1 *Pet.* 2. 3, and 14. With the Pope exempting the Clergy from ſubjection to their Kings; Saint *Peter* making no mention in his Epiſtles of invocation of Saints, of adoration of Images, of Reliques, of Purgatory, of Indulgences, of the Treaſure of the Church, of *Limbus*, of the Service in an unknown Tongue, of his Supremacy, nor uſurping any title to himſelf, that was not common to the other Apoſtles, with the Pope, who teacheth all theſe things, and in his Bulls attributeth to himſelf ſuch titles as Saint *Peter* never admitted of in his Epiſtles; then may it eaſily be conjectured what little modicum of aſſurance there is, that the Pope cannot degenerate from the purity of Saint *Peter*, nor be alienated from his doctrine.

And note, that although Saint *Peter* was exempted from error, by the continual aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, which Jeſus Chriſt had promiſed to the Apoſtles, nevertheleſs neither he, nor any Apoſtle uſed this arrogant language, vaunting of their impoſſibility to err. As the Pope is the only Chriſtian Prelate which maketh himſelf to be called God, ſo is he the only Creature which qualifieth himſelf with Infallibility, to the end to make him reſemble God. Imitating herein the falſe Doctors who taught the *Jews* to ſay, ‘ That the Law ſhall not periſh from the Prieſt, ‘ nor the Council from the Wiſe, nor the Word from ‘ the Prophet.

§ Jer. 18. 18.

It

It is not requiſite to prove this maxim any further, 'That the Biſhop of *Rome* cannot err in the Faith,' to be falſe and contradicted (in the experience of ſo many ages) by ſo many holy Doctors, who have ſo often condemned the Biſhops of *Rome*; by ſo many Councils, damning the *Romiſh* Church, and the Biſhop of *Rome* for error and hereſy; by the teſtimony of numbers of our adverſaries, who reject this maxim; and by the confeſſion of the Popes themſelves. This hath been amply proved in my firſt Treatiſe.

Upon which ſo falſe a maxim, are grounded all Traditions of the Church of *Rome*, as a multitude of flies ſitting upon a floating plank; or a number of Chymeras hanging at a Spiders thread, which breaketh at a blaſt. It is their plaiſter for all evil. They make new Articles of Faith moſt gainful to his Holineſs; Idolatry, Merchandiſe, Tyranny, Corruption of the benefit and nature of Jeſus Chriſt is eſtabliſhed. And in concluſion they pay us with this maxim, that the Church cannot err; and by the Church they underſtand the *Romiſh*; and by the *Romiſh* Church the Pope of *Rome*. Thus the *Romiſh* Church forbiddeth all ſorts of errors by an error, in ſaying, *I cannot err*, ſupplying with preſumption that which is wanting in reaſon. She is exempted from giving reaſon of her doctrine, for ſhe herſelf judgeth that ſhe hath reaſon. Such an error is the worſt of all; for by this means a man becometh Judge of the Word of God, and maketh Religion to depend upon his will. And he that ſaith *I cannot err*, will never reform his error, nor ſubject himſelf to any rule; for he believeth himſelf to be rule. How ſhall he be raiſed up, who believeth he cannot fall?

The third Maxim whereon our adverſaries ground their Traditions, hath no more certainty, than the other two precedent. They preſuppoſe without proof, that 'Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles have ſpoken many things which they did not commit to writing.' Upon this preſuppoſition they build another, the moſt inconſiderate and unreaſonable that can be. For they would have it believed, that thoſe things which the Apoſtles

Apoſtles did not ſet down in writting, are the Traditions of the Romiſh Church at this time; and therefore conclude, that when Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke ſeverally and apart to his Diſciples, he conferred with them about the ſervice of Images, and adoration of Reliques, about Indulgences and Superabundant ſatisfactions of the Saints, which the Pope ought to lock up in his Treaſury; about Invocation of Saints, about the crowning of his Mother in the dignity of Queen of Heaven, and of the Angels; about private Maſſes, the Communion under one kind, bleſſed Beads, and *Agnus Dei*, &c. This is a daring conjecture, whereon if the faith of the faithful be founded, all Religion ſhall conſiſt of ſuppoſition: and the Pope ſhall have good recreation to invent Traditions which ſhall turn to his profit; for ſuch conjectures are taken for Oracles, and laid down for a foundation of the Chriſtian faith.

But they are aſhamed of this, and contradict themſelves: For knowing that theſe Traditions are new Inventions, they ſpeak freely that neither Chriſt nor the Apoſtles have taught all, either by mouth or by writing, and that the Popes from time to time have added many doctrines eſſential and neceſſary, reſerving to themſelves the power of altering that which God hath commanded in the Scripture, of adding to the Creed, of diſpenſing againſt the Apoſtle, and of eſtabliſhing new Articles of faith, as we have ſhewed by multitudes of proofs, and by the practice of the Church of Rome. So as now we are not to conſider what doctrines have been taught from the mouth of the Apoſtles, but it is endeavoured to make us receive all the Traditions which the Popes have added, not only to the Scriptures, but alſo to the preaching of the Apoſtles, for inviolable laws and infallible rules.

Our adverſaries then come back to this, that the Church of Rome cannot err in her Traditions, for ſhe cannot err in this Tradition, that *ſhe cannot err*. They would have us believe the Tradition of the Romiſh

miſh Church, becauſe the Tradition of that Church hath ſo ordained it. So as this third Maxim leadeth us back to the ſecond, which holdeth, that *the Pope cannot err:* and this Maxim that the Pope cannot err, leadeth us to the firſt, that is to ſay, to the Succeſſion of St. *Peter*, (whereof God ordained nothing) from whence they have made this infallibility to ſpring forth.

It is lamentable to hear, how they ſpeak of the antiquity of their Traditions, yea, when they be freſh and modern. They heard their fathers ſay, that they heard from others, and they again from others, that the Apoſtles have taught theſe things by mouth only, and did diſperſe them amongſt ſome few. Thus they make a brittle cord which bindeth not the conſciences, and their belief ſtriving to rove back through fifteen or ſixteen ages, wherein they ſee not one jot, is loſt in the way; inſtead of beginning at the fountain, to wit, at Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and to learn in their writings that which they have taught: For, a Commandment of the Lord, or of the Apoſtles, had in one word freed them from all doubt and difficulty.

CHAP. XII. *That our Adverſaries alledging the Scripture do contradict themſelves, and alledge Scripture for Traditions in general without touching the particulars, wherein they find the Scripture contrary.*

IT is the property of lying to ſay and unſay, involving it ſelf in contradictions. Our adverſaries build the authority of the Scripture upon the Tradition of the Church: And then contradicting themſelves, they labour to ground Tradition upon the teſtimony of Scripture.

Their cuſtom is to alledge Scripture, not to defend every one of their Traditions in particular; but they endeavour to prove in general, that the Scripture ſpeaketh of Traditions, and approveth

them. Preſuppoſing without proof, that the Traditions whereof the Scripture maketh mention, are thoſe which in our times are received by the Church of Rome, and whereof the body of Papiſtry is compounded.

And herein they do wiſely. For what ſhould they find in the Scripture, that may be of uſe to uphold ſo many new inventions? unleſs perhaps they would ground the abridgment of the Cup upon the words of our Saviour, * *Drink ye all of it.* And upon the words of St. *Paul* writing to the people of Corinth. † *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.* As likewiſe, *We are all partakers of one and the ſame Bread, and one and the ſame Cup,* according to the vulgar tranſlation.

Or they would ground the ſingle life of Prieſts and Biſhops upon the Apoſtle's Commandment, wherein he chargeth ‖‖ *a Biſhop to be huſband of one wife, having his children in ſubjection with all gravity:* as alſo, ‖ *If they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.*

Or Invocation of Saints, upon the words of *Solomon,* that § *God only knoweth the hearts of men.* And upon thoſe of St. *Paul,* ‡ *How ſhall they call upon him in whom they have not believed?* And upon thoſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *When ye pray, ſay, Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.* Luke, 11. 2.

Or private Maſſes and without Communicants, upon this reaſon that St. *Paul* calleth the holy Supper ‡‡ *A Communion.* And upon this that Jeſus Chriſt giving bread to his diſciples, hath ſaid, *Take, eat:* for in their ſolitary Maſſes, no man aſſiſteth, to whom the Prieſt may ſay, *Take.*

---

* Matth. 26. 27. † 1 Cor. 11. 28. & chap. 10. 17.
‖‖ 1 Tim. 3. ver. 2. & 4. ‖ 1 Cor. 7. 9.
§ 2 Chro. 6 30. ‡ Rom. 10. 14. ‡‡ 1 Cor. 10. 16.

Or the power of the Pope to depoſe Kings, and to make them kiſs his feet, upon theſe ſentences of the Apoſtles, * *Fear God, Honour the King:* and upon this, † *Let every man be ſubject to ſuperior powers:* and upon the example of Jeſus Chriſt, who payed tribute, and waſhed his Apoſtles feet.

Or Service and Prayers in a ſtrange language, upon that which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh ‖ *Except you utter by the tongue words eaſy to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken? for ye ſhall ſpeak into the Air.* And, *I had rather ſpeak in the Church five words with my underſtanding, than ten thouſand in an unknown tongue.*

Or difference of meats, upon that which the Apoſtle ſaith: § *If any of them that believe not, invite you to a feaſt, and ye be diſpoſed to go, whatſoever is ſet before you, eat, aſking no queſtion for conſcience ſake.* And upon that which the ſame Apoſtle calleth the inſtructions of thoſe that ſaid, *(touch not, taſte not, handle not,)* human Commandments and doctrines, although they were made for devotion, and to ſubdue the fleſh, as he hath it in the 2 *chap.* to the *Coloſ.* 21. 22. 23.

Or merit of works of condignity as they are called, or of equivalence and congruity, upon the words of our *Saviour*, ‡ *When you ſhall have done all that is commanded you, ſay, we are unprofitable ſervants.*

Or works of ſupererogation not commanded, upon the ſum of the Law, which injoyneth to love God with all the heart, and with all the ſtrength. For in theſe words is commanded all the good that man can do, and upon that where St. *Paul* in the 4 to the *Phil.* 8. chargeth us to addict our ſelves to all things commendable and virtuous, whereupon it followeth that if the works of ſupererogation are virtuous and praiſe worthy, they are commanded; and upon this that the perfection of

---

* 1 Pet. 2. 17. † Rom. 13. 1. ‖ 1 Cor. 14. 9. & 19. § 1 Cor. 10. 27. ‡ Luke 17. 10.

the Angels doth conſiſt in obeying the Commandment of God, *Pſal.* 103. 20. and not to do more than he hath commanded.

Or borrowed ſatisfactions, upon that which the Apoſtle teſtifieth, that every man ſhall carry his own burthen, *Galat.* 6. 5. and that every man ſhall receive his own proper reward, according to his own labour. 1 *Cor.* 3. 8.

Or offerings of Prieſts, in making ſacrifices for the living and the dead, upon that which Jeſus Chriſt hath ſaid, *Do this in remembrance of me:* which is the place for proof thereof, that the Council of Trent in the 22 Seſſion will have to be received of every man under pain of an *Anathema.*

Or feſtival play days, upon the commandment of God ſpeaking: * *Six days ſhalt thou labour.*

Or the power of the Pope to ſet at liberty under ground, and to give Indulgences to the dead, upon that which Jeſus Chriſt ſayth, † *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind and looſe on earth, &c.*

Or caſes reſerved to the Pope, upon the words of our Saviour uttered to all the Apoſtles, ‖ *Whoſe ſins ſoever ye ſhall pardon they ſhall be pardoned.*

Or images of the Almighty upon that which God diſcourſing to the People of Iſrael, giveth the reaſon why in ſpeaking to them from Heaven he ſuffered none to ſee any image or reſemblance: § *For fear* (ſaith he) *Leſt ye might forget the Covenant which he made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeneſs of any thing male or female.*

Or eſtabliſhing of brothel-houſes at Rome by the authority of his holineſs, upon the commandment, ‡ *Thou ſhalt not commit adultery.*

Or the doctrine of the Council of Trent, affirming in the fifth Seſſion that covetouſneſs is no ſin, upon the law of God, ſpeaking, ** *Thou ſhalt not covet:*

---

* Exod. 20. 9. † Matth. 18. 18. ‖ John 20. 21.
§ Deut. 4. 23. ‡ Deut. 4. 13. ** Deut. 5. 21.

covet: And upon the teſtimony of the Apoſtle, ſaying, that he hath learnt out of the law, that ‖‖ *covetouſneſs is ſin.*

Or forbidding the People to read the Scripture, upon that which is written in the *Apocal.* †† *Bleſſed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy*; and upon the example of ‡‡ *the People of Berea who ſearched the Scriptures daily*; and upon the commandment made to * *Kings, to read carefully the book of the law of God.*

Or ſwearing by reliques, upon the commandment of God: † *Thou ſhalt fear the Eternal, and ſwear by his name.*

Or Purgatory, upon that which the Lord ſaid unto the thief upon the Croſs: ‡ *Thou ſhalt be with me this day in Paradiſe*; and upon the example of ‖ *Lazarus*, whoſe ſoul was carried by the Angels into *Abraham*'s boſom immediately after his death; and upon the Apoſtle St. *John*, ſpeaking, § *That the blood of Jeſus Chriſt purgeth us from all ſin.*

Or the ſacrifice of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Maſs, upon that which the Apoſtle to the Hebrews (ſpeaking of the ſacrifice of the death of Jeſus Chriſt made upon the Croſs) declareth, that §§ *We are ſanctified through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* And that ‡ *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often: For as it is ordained for all men to dye once, ſo Chriſt hath been offered once to take away our ſins*, making the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt no more reiterable than the death of men.

Without all doubt if contrariety to the Scripture can give authority to the Romiſh Traditions, theſe Traditions which I have ſpecified, ought to be of great authority.

Yea to ſum up all, our adverſaries are too licencious

‖‖ Rom. 7. 7.
* Deut. 17. 18.
‖ Luke 17. 22. & 14.
†† Apoc. 1. 3.
† Deut. 10. 20.
§. 1 John 1. 7.
*‡ Heb. 9. 25. & 26.
‡‡ Acts 17. 11.
‡ Luke 23. 43.
§§ Heb. 10. 10.

and raſh in their conjectures, and I cannot conceive that they believe it themſelves, when they would have us to believe, that Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaking in private with his Diſciples, did confer about the ſervice of Images, and great Pardons to be made by the Pope, of Chaplets, and Bleſſed-beads, of leſſening the torment of Souls in Purgatory by Maſſes and Indulgences, &c. To what may this tend but to expoſe Jeſus Chriſt to laughter? or to delight themſelves in feigning matters without proof? And to allure thoſe that will be deluded, to believe things that are incredible? For ſuch kind of preſuppoſitions work their effect, according as he is awed that propoundeth them.

CHAP. XIII. *That our adverſaries to diſtinguiſh the good Traditions from the bad, do give us a Plea wherein they wholly convict themſelves.*

TO diſcern the good Traditions from the bad, our adverſaries lay down certain Pleas which we hold fit to have ſtrictly examined. They ſay that the Traditions ought to be both received and believed to be divine, which have always been approved by the univerſal Church, as *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* confirmeth it, allowing that to be received for truth which hath ever been believed wholly and by all, and St. *Auguſtin in his Epiſtle*, 118. * 'If the Church 'throughout the world obſerve any thing, it is a di'ſtracted impudence to diſpute whether it ought to 'ſo or no;' and in his 4 Book againſt the Donatiſts Chapter 4. † 'That which the univerſal Church 'holdeth, and hath not been inſtituted by Councils, 'but ever maintained, is to be believed in all juſt

---

* Si quid horum tota per orbem frequentat Eccleſia, hoc quin ita faciendum ſit diſputare inſolentiſſimæ inſaniæ eſt.

† Quod univerſa tenet Eccleſia, nec Conciliis, inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum, non niſi authoritate Apoſtolica traditum certiſſimè creditur.

'reaſon,

'reaſon, not to have been ordained by other power 'than the Apoſtolique Authority.'

Now though theſe paſſages of Saint *Auguſtine* be unſeaſonably alledged, becauſe they ſpeak of Cuſtoms not neceſſary to ſalvation, and indifferent in their nature, or of opinions without the knowledge whereof a man may be ſaved, as we ſhall hereafter diſcover; yet I ſay that by this Plea, the Traditions of the Church of *Rome* do fall to the ground, and are not currant or receivable; for it is eaſy to prove, that they have not been received from the beginning by the Catholick Church.

How is it that Purgatory (which is by interpretation, a ſubterraneal fire, where the ſouls of the faithful are purged by torment) could be believed in the antient Church, ſeeing that a great part of the Fathers did believe, that the ſouls could not be tormented without the bodies? And that the Maſs prayeth for ſouls that ſleep in a peaceable reſt? It being a clear caſe that when this piece was patched to the Canon of the Maſs, the Church of *Rome* did not believe that the ſouls of the faithful were tortured in a fire. Pope *Gregory* the I. in his *Dialogues*, ſeateth Purgatory in the ſmoke of Baths, and in the wind; for this underground fire was not yet deviſed: and yet this time was ſo far advanced as to the year 590, of our Lord.

Invocation of Saints was unknown under the three firſt ages of the Chriſtian Church, and more than half of the fourth. Cardinal *Bella.* in his third book of worſhipping Saints, Chap. 9. ſaith, that '‡ When the holy Scriptures were written, the cuſtom 'was not yet to make vows to Saints.' Which is as much as to ſay in plain Terms, that about the Apoſtles time, Saints were not called on, nor did the

‡ §. *Præterea.* Cùm ſcriberentur ſcripturæ ſanctæ, nondum cœperat uſus vovendi ſanctis.

Apoſtles (who ſurvived the Virgin *Mary*) addreſs their vows unto her. And Cardinal *Perron* § (to whom this commendation is due, to be the beſt verſed in the ſtudy of the Fathers) confeſſeth freely, that in the Authors neareſt approaching to the Apoſtles time, there appeareth no trace of this cuſtom of invoking Saints. Yea, he acknowledgeth that then when Saint *Auguſtin* wrote, (which was ſome 420 years after the birth of our Saviour) the doctrine of thoſe which hold that the Saints know not the occurrences of things acted here below, was not condemned, and that the Church had not yet made a deciſion thereupon; and indeed all that our Adverſaries alledge out of the Fathers of the three firſt ages, and more than half the fourth upon this queſtion, are paſſages, ſerving to prove that the Saints pray for us, which is a point that willingly we condeſcend unto; but not to prove it behoveful for us to invoke the Saints, nor to allow them a religious ſervice.

The approbation of the Books of *Maccabees* (amongſt other books divine and canonical) is inferted by our Adverſaries, in their unwritten Traditions. Yet this is not a Tradition received from the beginning by all the Catholick Church; ' * the Council of *Laodicea* rejecteth them; and *Meliton* Biſhop of *Sardius*, near the time of the Apoſtles, and *Origen*, and *Tertullian*, and *Euſebius*, and *Athanaſius*, and *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, and *Hilary* and *Gregory* of *Nazianzen*,

---

§ *Du Perron contre de la Roy Grand Bretagne.* page 1009. Et quat aux auteurs plus proches du ſiecle Apoſtolique, encore qu'il ne s'y trouve pas de veſtiges de ceſte couſtume, &c. page 994. Quelques particuliers croyoient que les ames des fideles n'avoient point la viſion de Dieu avant le jugement final, &c. L'Egliſe n'avoit point encore prononcé la deciſion la deſſus.

* Le Concile de Laodica Can. 58. Meliton allegué par Euſebe au. 5. lib. de ſon hiſtoire chap. 24. Origine ſur le primier Pſ allegué par Euſeb. lib. 6. cap. 24. Tertull. au 4. livre de ſes. Carmes. Euſebe Chron. Olymp. 116 Cyrillus Catecheſi quarta. Athanaſ. Epiſt. 39. & Synopſ. Nazianz. Carmin. Epiph. de menſuris et ponderibus. Hilar. prologo Pſalmorum.

and

and *Amphilochius*, Biſhop of *Iconia*, and *Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Salamine*, and *Philaſtrius*, Biſhop of *Breſſe*; and Saint *Jerom* in *Prologo Galeato*, and in his Preface upon the Books of *Solomon*, and *Ruffin* upon the Lord's Prayer all of theſe were perſons remarkable in the third and fourth ages. Yea, and Pope *Gregory* the Firſt, who wrote near upon the End of the fifth age in the 19th of his morals, chap. 17. as we have proved elſewhere in ample manner; wherefore, this is no Tradition received wholly and at all times by the Church univerſal.

By this very Plea the *Romiſh* Indulgences ought to be rejected, the which Indulgences I underſtand to be a Tradition, wherewith the Pope heapeth up the ſuperfluity of the ſatisfactions of Jeſus Chriſt and the Saints, to the treaſure of the Church, and converteth them to payment for others by his Indulgences, which he hoardeth in certain Churches of *Rome*, and cauſeth that the people from all parts repair thither to purchaſe pardons. I ſay that theſe Indulgences are new, and that neither the Apoſtles nor their Diſciples did convert the ſuperabundance of the ſufferings of *Abraham*, or of Saint *John* the *Baptiſt*, or of the Virgin *Mary* to payment for others, and kept no Treaſury to hold the ſuperabounding ſatisfactions of the Saints, and gave no pardons of one or two hundred thouſand years, as the Pope doth, and that theſe Indulgences have been altogether unknown in the firſt ages of the Chriſtian Church, by the plain confeſſion of our Adverſaries. Cardinal *Cajetan* in the ſecond Chapter of his Treatiſe of Indulgences, hath theſe words; ‘ ‡ if we could have any certainty concerning the original

‡ De ortu Indulgentiarum ſi certitudo habere poſſet, veritati indagandæ opem ferret. Verum quia nulla ſacræ Scripturæ, nulla priſcorum Doctorum Græcorum aut Latinorum authoritas ſcripta hanc ad noſtram deduxit notitiam, ſed hoc ſolum á trecentis annis ſcripturæ commendatum & de veteſtis Patribus, &c. Gabriel Biel Lect. 57. Dicendum quod ante tempora B. Gregorii modicus vel nullus fuit uſus

'ginal of Indulgences, it would help us much in the 'diſquiſition of the truth; but we have not by writ-'ing, any authority, either of the holy Scripture, or 'of antient Doctors, *Greek* or *Latin*, that affordeth us 'the leaſt knowledge thereof.' *Gabriel Biel* Lect. 57, upon the Canon of the Maſs, 'We muſt confeſs that 'before the time of *Gregory* (that is to ſay in the 'ſix firſt ages) the uſe of Indulgences was very little 'or none at all; but now the practice of them is 'grown frequent, for without doubt the Church hath 'the Spirit of Chriſt her Spouſe, and therefore er-'reth not.' *Navarrus* the Pope's Penetentiary, 'what 'is the cauſe that among the Antients, ſo little 'mention is made of Indulgences, and amongſt the 'modern they are in ſuch uſe? *John* of *Rochester*, 'moſt holy and reverend for his dignity of Biſhop 'and Cardinal, hath taught us the reaſon, ſaying, 'that the explicit Faith, whether it be of Purgatory, 'or of Indulgences, was not ſo neceſſary in the 'primitive Church as now.' And a little after: 'Whilſt there was no heed taken to Purgatory, no 'man enquired after *Romiſh* Indulgences, becauſe 'thereupon dependeth the property and worth of 'them.'

Antony Archbiſhop of *Florence* (whom the Pope canonized for a Saint) ſpeaketh to the ſame purpoſe,

---

uſus Indulgentiarum. Nunc autem crebreſcit earum uſus, quia ſine dubio Eccleſia habens ſpiritum ſponſi ſui, Chriſti, et ideirco non errans, &c. Navarrus Comment. de Jubel et Indulg. pag. 545. Quare autem apud antiquos tam rara, & apud recentiores tam frequens ſit Indulgentiarum mentio, docuit ille vir ſanctiſſimus, &c. Johannis Roſſenſis cujus ea de re verborum ſumma eſt; Quod non certo conſtat à quo primum tradi cœperint, &c. Quod multa de Evangeliis et aliis ſcripturis nunc ſunt excuſa luculentius & intellectu perſpicacius quam fuerunt olim. Quod nemo jam dubitat orthodoxus an Purgatorium ſit, de quo tamen apud priſcos illos nulla vel quam rariſſima fiebat mentio. Quod non fuit tam neceſſaria ſive Purgatorii ſive Indulgentiarum fides explicita in primitiva eccleſia atque nunc eſt, &c. Anton. Summa S. Theolog. part. 1. Tit. 10. c. 3. de Indul. fol. 202. Venetiis ann. 1582.

'Touching

'Touching Indulgences we have nothing expreſly 'recited in holy Scripture, although the ſaying 'of the Apoſtle be alledged upon this ſubject, 1 *Cor.* '*If I have pardoned any thing, I have done it for* '*your ſake, in the perſon of Chriſt.* Nor are found 'at all in the writings of the antient Doctors, but 'of the modern.' It is therefore no ſmall abuſe to place Indulgences amongſt Apoſtolick Traditions.

Of the ſame rank is that Tradition which excludeth the people from the coummunion of the cup, it is a modern tradition, and forged *de novo*, concerning the which we have the confeſſion of the Council of *Conſtance*, held in the year 1416, which is the firſt Council that ever made the abridgment of the cup to paſs with legal authority, mark the words, 'Though in the pri-'mitive Church this Sacrament was received by the 'Faithful under both kinds, yet this cuſtom was in-'troduced with good reaſon, that it ſhould be taken 'in both kinds by thoſe that conſecrate, but by the '*Laicks* under the *ſpecies* of bread only.' And the Council of *Baſil* in the 30th Seſſion; 'The *Laicks* are 'not bound by the Commandment of our Lord, to re-'ceive the Sacrament under both kinds. Theſe Councils do acknowledge that God's Commandment, and the cuſtom of the antient Church, is to give both kinds to the people, but they will not ſuffer the Church to be obliged to this Commandment, and when our adverſaries endeavour to defend themſelves in this point by antiquity, they vouch examples of ſome ſick perſons receiving but in one kind, or of ſome that could not taſte or endure wine, or of ſome ſuperſtitious people, who would carry the conſecrated bread from the Church home to their houſes, and there lock it up in coffers; but they bring no prohibition of giving the cup to the *Laicks*, nor any example of any antient Church, which hath celebrated the holy Sacrament in the aſſembly of the faithful, without offering the cup to the Communicants; nor any example of denial to adminiſter the cup to the people; yet this is the

point

point of difference, and which is now in controverſy It was upon this abridgment of the cup, that Cardinal *Perron* and Jeſuit *Vaſquez* formerly told us, that the Church was able to change the inſtitution of our Lord, and the commandment of the Apoſtle.

‖ As for painting God and repreſenting the Trinity in ſtone or in wood, this Tradition hath not been received by all, nor at all times, and conſequently is neither divine nor Apoſtolick, I could produce multitudes of paſſages of Antients that condemn this abuſe, but for the preſent, the teſtimony of Pope *Gregory* the ſecond, and Cardinal *Baronius* ſhall ſuffice. This Cardinal in the year 726 of his annals, citeth an Epiſtle of the ſame *Gregory*, wherein are found theſe words; 'Why do not we place before 'our eyes; and ſet forth in painting the Father of 'our Lord Jeſus Chriſt? It is becauſe we know not 'what he is, and the nature of God cannot be painted 'or brought in ſight.' Upon which words *Baronius* noted this ſaying, in the Margin, '* Afterwards it 'came by cuſtom into the Church, that God the fa-'ther and the Holy Ghoſt were painted,' this is therefore new, and hath not been received by all and at all times in the Catholick Church.

The ſervice of Images was ſo generally unknown in the primitive Church of the three firſt ages, that the very trades of painting and graving were execrable amongſt the Chriſtians. *Tertullian* reproacheth *Hermogenes* his trade of painting as a thing infamous. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in his doctrinal, and *Juſtin Martyr* againſt *Trypho* ſpeak of theſe trades, as of unlawful Arts.

The power of Popes to depoſe Kings, and give and take Kingdoms, is yet of a freſh date, and there is not found any rule for it, nor example, nor the

---

‖ 6. Images of God.

* Poſtea uſu venit, ut pingatur in Eccleſia Deus Pater et Spiritus ſanctus.

leaſt

leaſt ſign of footing in all antiquity. *Perron* in his Oration pronounced before the States of *Paris* the 15th of *Jan.* 1615. could not yield one example for the five firſt ages, and thoſe which he alledgeth before the year 1076. are all either falſe or uſeleſs. *Gregory* the ſeventh in the year 1076. pronouncing ſentence of depoſition againſt the Emperor *Henry* the 4. enterpriſed a thing without example, which alſo turned to his confuſion. Cardinal *Bellarmin* diſputing this ſame queſtion againſt *Barkley*, perceiving himſelf deſtitute of all teſtimony of antiquity, hath recourſe to the authority of the Church of the latter ages, ſaying: * 'He judgeth 'not rightly of the Church of Chriſt, who receiveth 'nothing but that which he readeth, to have been ex'preſly written or done in the ancient Church, as if 'the Church of this latter time had ceaſed to be a 'Church, or had not the faculty of unfolding and de'claring, yea of eſtabliſhing, and commanding things 'appertaining to the Faith and manners of Chriſtians.' In brief, this uſurpation is not a Tradition received by all, and in all time, nor could be at that time practiſed, when the Chriſtian Emperors depoſed Popes, and made them priſoners, and puniſhed them with death, and took of them a ſum of money for their reintegration in the Biſhoprick, as may be ſeen in the 123. Nov. of *Juſtinian*, chap. 3.

† And how can the Canon of the Maſs be an Apoſtolique Tradition, when the perſons therein named were after the Apoſtles time, more than two hundred years? namely *Coſmus* and *Damian*, who ſuffered martyrdom in the year of our Lord, 285. § likewiſe we

---

* Bellarmin. in Barkl. cap. 3. Non rectè de Eccleſia Chriſti ſentit, qui nihil admittit, niſi quod expreſſè in veteri Eccleſia ſcriptum aut factum eſſe legitur. Quaſi Eccleſia poſterioris temporis aut deſierit eſſe Eccleſia, aut facultatem non habeat explicandi et declarandi conſtituendi etiam et jubendi quæ ad fidem & mores Chriſtianos pertinent.

§ Voyez. les livres des myſteres de la Maſſe de Innocent 3. Et Platine en la vie de Sexte 1. Et de Pontifical de Damaſ.

could

could produce many authors amongſt our adverſaries, who affirm that this Pope and that Pope have added ſuch and ſuch a parcel to the Maſs, and yet the whole Canon of the Maſs is contrary both to Purgatory, to the Merit of Works, and to Tranſubſtantiation; for in the Canons of the Maſs the Prieſt prayeth for the ſouls *that ſleep in peaceable reſt and Tranquillity*, and not for thoſe that are tormented in a fire, and craveth at God's hands * *that he will not weigh our merits, but that he will grant us pardon*, and holding the conſecrated hoſt, ſaith, † *Theſe are the good things which God always createth, ſanctifieth, and bleſſeth, offering them through Jeſus Chriſt*, ‡ and humbly beſeecheth that God would as freely accept of theſe gifts and preſents, as of the Calf or Lamb offered by *Abel*, of all this there is nothing but may ſort well and agree with Jeſus Chriſt, and true it is that the Maſs being punctually conſidered, appeacheth and condemneth the *Romiſh* Church of this time, and (as now it is,) muſt be far differing from that of heretofore; for *Gregory* the firſt, in the 63. Epiſtle of his 7. book affirmeth, that the Apoſtles did conſecrate the Euchariſt with only the Lord's prayer.

As for Monaſtical profeſſion, it can neither be a Divine nor Apoſtolical Tradition, nor believed always by all, for *Paul* the Hermit was the firſt of that calling, and made no diſciples at all, but died in the year of our Lord 343. Particularly in the Church of *Rome*, this profeſſion was neither ſeen nor practiſed, until about the year of our Lord 370. for this is the time whereof Saint *Hierom* ſpeaketh, in his Epitaph of *Marcella*, 'No Women (ſaith he) of great parentage 'knew yet at *Rome* what this Monacal profeſſion did 'mean, nor durſt take this name, which was ſo vile

---

* Canon Miſſæ. Non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ largitor.

† Per quem hæc omnia Domine ſemper bona creas, ſanctificas, benedicis.

‡ Supra quæ (domine) propitio ac ſereno vultu reſpicere digneris et accepta habeas ſicut accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui juſti Abel.

'and

'and ſignominious amongſt the people, becauſe of 'the novelty of the thing, as then it was eſteemed.' moreover the Monks of that time were of a far different condition from theſe of this our time.

In ſum, (not to run over all the traditions of the *Romiſh* Church,) I maintain that in the four firſt ages (I could deſcend a little lower) no antient Church can be ſhewn unto us, which hath approved, 1. The Maſſes without Communicants. 2. The images of the Trinity. 3. Or that hath made mention of the treaſure of *Romiſh* Indulgences. 4. Or that hath forbidden the people to read the ſacred Scripture. 5. Or that hath deprived the people of the Communion of the Cup. 6. Or that hath rendered any religious ſervice to Images. 7. Or that hath inſtructed the people to pray to God in a tongue not underſtood by him that prayeth. 8. Or that hath called the Virgin *Mary* Queen of Heaven and Lady of the world. 9. Or that hath believed the *Limbus* for little infants. 10. Or that hath taught, that the Pope can give and take kingdoms. 11. Or that the Pope can canonize Saints, and free ſouls out of Purgatory, I could rehearſe many more if need were.

Pope *Martin* in his Canon *Si quis Preſbyter* the 30. Diſt. ordaineth for an Apoſtolical Tradition, the prohibition of kneeling at Prayer, between the Paſchal and Pentecoſt; yet doth it well appear in the 20. of the *Acts* ver. 36. and in the 21. ver. the 5. that Saint *Paul* and the faithful with him, humbled themſelves upon their knees at that time, whereupon *Baronius* in his Annals, reprehendeth this Pope for having celebrated the Pentecoſt *nequaquam Chriſtiano more*, not after a Chriſtian faſhion. *Ann.* 58. *Sect.* 102. but if this cuſtom be an Apoſtolick Tradition, why doth not the Church of *Rome* continue the practiſe thereof?

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV. *A proof of the ſame, by the Traditions which our adverſaries do ſuppoſe to be the moſt antient and beſt grounded in antiquity.*

TO the end it may not be ſaid, that for our advantage, we pick out their moſt modern Traditions, and leaſt countenanced with antiquity. I will inſiſt upon three, wherein our adverſaries take themſelves to ſtand upon ſureſt ground, and labour to overwhelm us with texts and places out of the Fathers; the firſt is prayer for the dead, ſecondly Lent, thirdly ſingle life of the Clergy.

For the firſt, I ſay that prayers for the Dead, which the *Romiſh* Church doth exerciſe, and are made for the Comfort of Souls in Purgatory, are ſo modern as not to have any mention or trace of them in all antiquity. For we have already expreſſed, and will further demonſtrate in its proper place, that the ancient Chriſtians prayed for the dead, ſleeping in a peaceable repoſe, and kept in hidden receptacles, expecting the Reſurrection, praying likewiſe that the dead ſhould riſe again to ſalvation, or that they ſhould be raiſed at a better hour than others, or that the fire at the laſt day of judgment ſhould burn them more ſuperficially and ſparingly, but for a prayer to eaſe and mitigate a burning ſoul in the fire of Purgatory, there is not any found in all antiquity: yea, in all the prayers of the Church of *Rome*, which are found in the Maſs for the dead, there is not ſo much as any whiſpering of Purgatory; and yet the Canon of the Maſs prayeth for the ſouls that ſleep in peaceable quietneſs: and at this day the Greek and Oriental Churches pray for the dead, and deny Purgatory. The ſecond book of the *Maccabees* at the 12. c. wiſheth us to pray for the dead, having reſpect to the reſurrection, ſaying likewiſe that to pray otherwiſe than thus, were trifling and dotage; briefly, I ſay that the prayers which the antient

tient Chriſtians did make for the dead, are utterly aboliſhed in the Church of *Rome*; and that he who ſhould pray at this time for the dead, after the manner of the ancient Church, ſhall be branded for an Heretick, and not eſcape the Inquiſition, for ſuch kind of prayers would not be gainful to the *Romiſh* Clergy; and the power of the Pope (not long ſince invented) * to give Indulgences to the dead, (and condemned by Pope *Gelaſius*,) ſhould vaniſh by ſuch prayers, and the traffick therein ſhould be diſſolved.

Secondly, Lent, (that is to ſay, the cuſtom of not eating fleſh, nor eggs for ſix and forty days before *Eaſter*) is not a tradition received into the Church from the beginning; indeed the word *Quadrageſſima* is found oftentimes in the Fathers of the fourth and fifth ages: but in the pure and unſuſpected writings of the Fathers of the three firſt ages, I never met with it, and we muſt note that this word (to take it originally) did ſignify a faſt of forty hours before *Eaſter*, which obſervation the ancient Chriſtians grounded upon that which Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke in the 9. of Saint *Mathew*, *They ſhall faſt when the Spouſe ſhall be taken from them.*' Now the ſpouſe, to wit, Jeſus Chriſt was taken from his Diſciples for forty hours: for there are juſt ſo many hours from the time that he was nailed to the Croſs unto his reſurrection. Nevertheleſs the cuſtoms did forthwith vary, ſome faſting two days, ſome three, ſome five, but though the cuſtom did alter, yet the ancient name did ſtill remain, and according as the obſervation hereof did increaſe, ſo in concluſion, this Faſt of forty hours is become by little and little a Faſt of forty days, whereof every one among the people did faſt his day, according as he ſaw good, except the Sabbath days: for to faſt on Gods day was judged a crime, the Spouſe being rendred

---

* *Gelaſius Commonitorio ad Fauſtum.* Super terram (inquit) nam in hac legatione defunctum nunquam dixit abſolvi.

to

to the Church on that day by his reſurrection. * There was none but the Church of *Rome* that faſted on *Saturdays*, whereof alſo it was condemned by the ſixth general Council at the 55. Canon: yea at *Milan* which is near *Rome*, they faſted not on *Saturdays*, as Saint *Auguſtin* teſtifieth in his 118. Epiſtle.

Thirdly, ſingle life of Prieſts and Biſhops cannot be an Apoſtolical Tradition, becauſe it was not practiſed at the time of the Apoſtles, nor many ages after them. But having ſpoken of this elſewhere at large, I will content myſelf for the preſent, with the teſtimony of the two moſt famous Cardinals of this age, *Baronius*, and *Perron*. ‖ *Baronius* in the 58. year of his Annals acknowledgeth, that married men were received to the function of Biſhop at the Apoſtles time, whereof he alledgeth divers cautes, and namely amongſt the reſt, the ſcarcity of unmarried men, eſpecially in *Crete*. § And *Perron* affirmeth, that this permiſſion laſted until the time of *Conſtantine*, that is to ſay, during the three firſt ages. But if he would have confeſſed the whole truth, he had acknowledged that in the Greek Churches, never was any time when Prieſts were not married, yea they ſo continue to this very day. And in the 13. Canon of the ſixth general Council, called at the Imperial Palace of Conſtantinople, doth formally condemn the Church of *Rome* upon this ſubject. *Eſtius* Doctor and Profeſſor at *Doway*, in his Commentary upon this paſſage of the Apoſtle 1 *Tim.* 3. *Let the Biſhop be huſband of one wife*, ſpeaketh thus: ‘ † We muſt confeſs that the Apoſtle ſuffereth us to chuſe

---

* Pay prouvé tout ce la par multitude de paſſages au 7. livre contre le Cardinal du Perron en la 5. contraverſe cap. 6. 7. et 8.

‖ Bar. Ann. 58. §. 14.

§ *Du Perron contre le Roy de la grand Bretagne* pag. 312. A cauſe reſpondrons nous, de la rareté des perſonnes mariees lors de la naiſſance de l'Egliſe, &c. Mais depuis comme l'Empereur Conſtantin, &c.

† Fatendum eſt Apoſtolum permittere ut in Epiſcopum elegatur qui uxorem habeat; verum id pro tempore, propter paucitatem eorum qui et cælibes eſſent, & ad Epiſcopatum idonei.

‘ a Biſh-

'a Biſhop that is married to one wife: but he teacheth 'this according to the time, becauſe of the fewneſs of 'unmarried men, and of ſuch as were fit for the functi-'on of a Biſhop.' Therefore this Tradition claimeth not the Apoſtles to be the Authors of it, and conſequently is not Apoſtolical; nor hath it been received at all times, and in all places.

I have inſiſted hereupon, not that we ſhould have deed of the authority of the ancients, to fight againſt *Romiſh* Traditions, (for refutation whereof, the word of God is ſufficient, and is only that which ought to judge us:) but to ſhew that our Adverſaries, ſuppoſing to eſtabliſh their Traditions, do plainly deſtroy them, and do give ſuch notes, whereby they draw their own indictment and conviction.

Nevertheleſs it is not without craft, that they will have Traditions to be examined by this touchſtone: to wit, whether they have been univerſally received at all times. For they know, that of thoſe who would examine their Traditions by this way, ſcarce one amongſt a thouſand can attain to the head of them, and that the people can inform themſelves nothing at all therein: for this examination cannot be made, but by the reading of all the Greek and Latin Fathers, and of all the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories ſince the continuation of ſixteen hundred years. All the books to this purpoſe would fill a ſpacious room, and are no more then ſealed letters to the people; yea amongſt the Clergy, not one of a hundred will be found that hath but ordinary knowledge therein. By this means our Adverſaries contrive the matter, that when their Traditions come to be examined, a way muſt be undertaken that is endleſs, wherein the people walk blindfold, and are conſtrained to repair to the teſtimony of ſuch men as preach theſe Traditions, and live by them: truly if by theſe directions men expect to arrive at the knowledge of ſalvation, I know not who can be ſaved.

The which moſt clearly appeareth in this, that the holy Scripture being the ſhort and ſure means to examine Traditions, they ſequeſter it far from the people's eyes, and divert them from reading thereof, appointing

pointing them to books, wherein they are neither comprehenſive, nor capable. It appeareth likewiſe in the examination of Traditions by the hiſtory of every age, wherein ordinarily they commence with the laſt age, and ſo walk retrograde in the calculation of their times, to the end they may arrive as late as poſſibly they can at the Apoſtles time and their writings.

CHAP. XV. *The ſecond mark ſet by our Adverſaries, to diſtinguiſh the good Traditions from the bad, to wit, Succeſſion.*

TO diſcern the good Traditions from the bad, our Adverſaries agree, that thoſe ought to be held for divine and Apoſtolical which are received by the Churches that derive their ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles.

This mark hath no more certainty than the former, and maketh as much againſt our Adverſaries. The doubtfulneſs of it is manifeſt in this, that the Churches of *Antioch*, of *Alexandria*, of *Epheſus*, of *Theſſalonica*, of *Candia*, &c. (which are contrary to the *Romiſh* Church, and more ancient) do boaſt themſelves to be of equal ſucceſſion, and one part of them challengeth a ſucceſſion from Saint *Peter:* yea before the Churches of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* did ſuffer any interruption, by the perſecutions of the *Mahometans*, they were often in diſcord with the Church of *Rome*, and were not in any wiſe ſubject unto it: and more particularly, the Church of *Theſſalonica* founded upon Saint *Paul*, and the Church of *Candia* where Saint *Paul* eſtabliſhed *Titus*, (from whom deſcended the Biſhops of *Candia*) keep a ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, which never was interrupted, and hath continued ſince the time of Chriſt, who ſpeaking from heaven, ſent the Apoſtle Saint *Paul*; yet notwithſtanding theſe Churches are ſeparated from a communion with the Church of *Rome*, and the Pope holdeth them for Schiſmaticks and Hereticks.

As for the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſo many ſchiſms dividing, and ſo many hereſies tainting his Seat (as our Adverſaries themſelves confeſs, and we have elſewhere proved) have

have long ſince broken the rank of this imaginary ſucceſſion.

Alſo the uncertainty of this ſucceſſion betrayeth itſelf, in that it is a mere tradition, ſo as if the ſervice of Images, or the Communion under one kind, be founded upon ſucceſſion; behold then Traditions founded upon a Tradition, and this Tradition founded upon human hiſtories, which may miſtake, yea often do jar and diſagree: wherefore this is an uncertainty founded upon another uncertainty, as atoms and motes carried upon the air.

But how ſhall a Mechanick, or a woman know this ſucceſſion? How ſhall they be aſſured that the ſecond Biſhop of *Rome* hath believed in the points of Religion as the firſt, the third as the ſecond, the fourth as the third, and ſo for ſixteen hundred years, though there never might have happened any alteration? Who doth not perceive that theſe men, by a palpable falſhood invent projects, whereof they know that the knowledge is impoſſible, and wherein the ſearch is a labour in vain, to the end that the ignorant finding themſelves muffled up in darkneſs, may catch hold and graſp the hand, which theſe men ſtretch forth to them, to be conductors of their blindneſs?

Yet let us briefly obſerve, what this ſucceſſion of the Church of Rome may ſignify or be: They bring us clauſes of antient Authors, reporting the Biſhop of Rome to be St. *Peter's* Succeſſor; and ſhew a Nomerclature of the Biſhops from St. *Peter* to this day: But we find that the antients make ſuch another Catalogue of the Biſhops of Jeruſalem, and of Antioch, whoſe ſucceſſion is of greater antiquity than that of the Biſhops of Rome. The Biſhops of Alexandria likewiſe draw out their ſucceſſion from St. *Peter*. But our Adverſaries will not have this ſucceſſion to be eſteemed, for (ſay they) thoſe Churches are heretical, and yet the ſame Churches alſo call the Church of Rome heretical and ſchiſmatical. Herein then lieth the point of difficulty, the antients reckon up the Succeſſors of St. *Peter*, and other Apoſtles in Jeruſalem,

in Antioch, at Rome, and at Alexandria: But they mean not they ſhould be Succeſſors of the Apoſtles in the Apoſtleſhip, they mean only in the government of ſuch and ſuch a particular Church, planted by one of the Apoſtles. So, putting the caſe that St. *Peter* founded the Church of Rome, and was there Biſhop, (which nevertheleſs is doubtful and miſtruſted) I will alſo agree that the Biſhops of Rome of the firſt ages have been Succeſſors to St. *Peter*, but in the Biſhoprick of the Church of the city of Rome only. In the ſame manner as *Simon* was Succeſſor to St. *James* the Apoſtle in the Biſhoprick of Jeruſalem, and *Timothy* Succeſſor to St. *Paul* in the Biſhoprick of Epheſus, but not in his Apoſtleſhip.

Our Adverſaries profit nothing by their allegations, if they prove not firſt by teſtimonies both divine and irrefragable, that God hath ordained St. *Peter* to have a Succeſſor in his Apoſtleſhip, and that the Biſhop of Rome was Succeſſor to St. *Peter*, in the dignity of the head of the univerſal Church. For ought not this ſucceſſion to have come from God? Did God eſtabliſh a ſupream and ſucceſſive head over the Church of all the world, without making any mention of it in his word? And did St. *Peter* himſelf forget to ſpeak of this ſucceſſion, from whence we have two long Epiſtles? ſee then whereupon we ſtand, and how our Adverſaries are taken. All their Religion is founded upon this Tradition, to wit, that the Pope hath been ordained from God, to be the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, in the charge of head of the univerſal Church; hereunto they bend their force, this is the ſcope of all the controverſies. And yet concerning this Tradition, they cannot produce one poor divine truth, nor one ſingle word out of the word of God: yea, when it cometh to human teſtimonies, it is apparent that they are contrary to this Monarchical ſucceſſion of the Pope of Rome.

In one thing our Adverſaries find themſelves much incumbred: We demand of them, when they ſpeak of a ſucceſſion, whether they underſtand it of perſons without ſucceſſion of doctrine, or of a ſucceſſion of perſons

perſons in the ſame doctrine: If they underſtand a ſucceſſion of perſons, ſitting in the ſame Chair, without ſucceſſion of doctrine, this ſucceſſion is impious, ſerving for a title of ſucceſſion to make war againſt God. He that corrupteth the Doctrine of his Predeceſſors, ſucceedeth them as ſickneſs ſucceedeth health, and darkneſs light; ſo *Gregory* of *Nazianzen* ſpeaketh in his Oration upon *Athanaſius*: '* To have the ſame Doc-'trine (ſaith he) is to have the ſame Seat; but to have 'a contrary Doctrine, is to have a contrary Seat: One 'hath the name, the other hath the truth of the ſucceſ-'ſion, &c. Unleſs a man will call it ſucceſſion, when the 'malady ſucceedeth health, and darkneſs the light.'

But if our Adverſaries ſpeaking of ſucceſſion, underſtand it of perſons, not only in the ſame Chair, but alſo in the ſame Doctrine, this ſucceſſion is excellent, and a ſingular ornament in a Church: No man can err in adhering to ſuch a ſucceſſion, for it carrieth conformity of Doctrine with the Apoſtles: and before this ſucceſſion can be known, it is behoveful to be inſtructed in the writings of the Apoſtles, and in their Doctrine.

Such a ſucceſſion is that whereof *Irenæus* ſpeaketh, ſaying, '† That we ought to obey Prieſts, who are in 'the Church, who have the ſucceſſion of the Apoſtles, 'and with the ſucceſſion of the Biſhoprick have re-'ceived the certain talent of the truth.' Not acknowledging ſucceſſion in the Biſhoprick, without ſucceſſion in the truth of the Doctrine. And *Tertullian* ſpeaking of the Hereticks: ‖ 'Their Doctrine being compared

---

* τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁμόγνωμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον. τὸ δὲ ἀλλόδοξον καὶ ἀλλόθρονον καὶ ἡ μὲν προσηγορίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀληθείας ἔχει διαδοχῆς— εἰ μὴ ἔτω τις λέγοι διάδοχον ὡς νόσον ὑγιείας, καὶ φωτὸς σκότος.

† *Iren. lib.* 4. *cap.* 43. Eis qui in Eccleſia ſunt Presbyteris obedire oportet, his qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis qui cum Epiſcopatus ſucceſſione charisma veritatis certum ſecundum placitum Patris acceperunt.

‖ Tertull. de præſcr. c. 21. Ipſa eorum doctrina cum Apoſtolica comparata ex diverſitate & contrarietate doctrinæ pronuntiabit neque Apoſtoli alicujus auctoris eſſe neque Apoſtolici.

'with

'with that of the Apostles, by the diversity, and contrariety therein, will plainly demonstrate, that it hath 'not any Apostle for Author, nor any one that is A-'postolical.' Snatching this specious title of Apostolick succession from those, who taught otherwise than the Apostles had done.

It is no small abuse (when we would know whether a Religion be true or no) to give us a list of Bishops in painting and pictures, without knowing whether the latter do teach as the first; pinning religion unto the Chairs, to the end to suppress the true rules and institutions: as also to divert the people from reading of the holy Scripture, for fear lest they should apprehend the conformity in Doctrine with the Apostles, which is the true succession.

We must note by the way, that in the time of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, who wrote about six score years after the Apostles, it was easy to shew the succession; Then (I mean) when the Churches wherein the Apostles had taught, did hold one and the same faith: I say, when the succession was of no great lenght, and the memory of the Apostles and their disciples preaching was fresh and familiar. But now that the Churches which were planted by the Apostles are divided into contrary Sects, and separated from communion, and that the confusions abounding in space of some fifteen hundred years, have thrown down so many Chairs, and reared up others, and that particularly the Bishoprick of Rome is turned into a temporal Monarchy, and the Pope of a Bishop is become a temporal Prince, this successive derivation of Chairs in the East and West is impossible, considering that the entail of this succession hath been thousands of times cut off, so that it is a meer imposture, to enter into this sea of Histories and confusions, to the end to examine the Traditions, instead of addressing our selves to the word of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI. *That the Phariſees and antient Hereticks had recourſe to Tradition, and the unwritten word, and that* Clemens Alexandrinus *ſuffered himſelf to be too much carried away in the ſame.*

THE cuſtom of Hereticks (both antient and modern) is, when they are at default in Scripture, to have recourſe to Traditions; *Joſephus* in his 3 book of Antiquities chap. the 18th affirmeth, that 'The Phariſees had very many obſervations by the 'ſucceſſive Tradition of their Fathers, which are not 'written in the law of Moſes.' Whereupon Jeſus Chriſt at the 15 of St. *Matthew* the 3. & 9. accuſeth them to have tranſgreſſed the Law of God by their Tradition; which Phariſaical Traditions were doctrines, that for the moſt part commanded things not expreſly forbidden in the Law of God: as to cleanſe their Pots and Veſſel, to waſh their bodies at return from Market, to lengthen out their Phylacteries, to faſt twice in a week, to pour forth longer prayers than ordinary, to make conſcience of healing the ſick, or journeying more than two miles upon the Sabbath. This I obſerve, to the end it may not be ſaid, that Jeſus Chriſt condemneth them only for teaching things expreſly forbidden in the law of God.

Tertullian in his book of preſcriptions, chap. the 25th. telleth us, that the Hereticks of his time affirmed, '§ That the Apoſtles had not revealed all 'things to all, but that they had commanded ſome 'things openly, and ſome in ſecret and to few.'

But the ſame *Tertullian* after he had written this book applieth himſelf to defend the Hereſies of *Montanus*, by the unwritten word, ſpeaking in the ſecond Chapter of his book of *Monogamy*, that ‡ 'Chriſt pro-

§ Non omnia voluit illis omnibus revelaſſe, quædam enim palam & univerſis, quædam ſecretò & paucis demandaſſe.

‡ De utroque autem Dominus pronunciavit. Adhuc habeo multa quæ loquar ad vos, &c.

'nounced his opinion thereupon, when he said, I 'have many things to tell you, but you cannot at this 'time bear them away.

Irenæus lived at the same time, who in his first book and fourth Chapter, saith, that '* The Carpocratian 'Hereticks affirmed, that Jesus had spoken in private 'to his Disciples, and had required of them, that they 'should teach these things a part to the worthy, and to 'such as give their approbation thereof,' and in his 2 chap. of the 3 book. '† When they are confuted 'by the Scriptures they revile, and turn again to ac-'cuse the Scriptures themselves; as if they were not 'as they should be, and had not sufficient authority, 'and because matters therein are diversly spoken, and 'that in them the truth cannot be found by those 'who are ignorant of Tradition; which they say was 'not given by writing but, *viva voce*, by word of 'mouth.'

Some twenty years after the death of St. *John*, one of his disciples named *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, addicted himself to the unwritten Traditions, ‖ 'the 'which were Parables, and strange doctrines, and o-'ther fabulous devices,' as *Eusebius* witnesseth, at the last chapter of the 3 book of his Ecclesiastical History.

Clemens Alexandrinus a most worthy Author to be read, (but one who hath his infirmities) venteth many vain things and false doctrines, drawn from Tradition, as for example, that the Greeks were justifyed by

* Jesum in mysterio discipulis suis seorsim loquutum & illos expostulasse ut dignis & assentientibus seorsum hæc traderent.

† Cum ex scripturis arguuntur in accusationem convertuntur scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neq, sint ex authoritate, & quia variæ sunt dictæ, & quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem.

‖ ξένας τὰς παραβολὰς τῦ σωτῆρος, καὶ διδασκαλίας ἀυτῦ καὶ ἕτερα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα.

Philosophy

Philoſophy; that Jeſus Chriſt deſcended into hell to Preach to the Jews; that the Apoſtles alſo deſcended thither, to Preach to the Gentiles; and many other the like fancies, all his books of his *Stromata* are full of them, eſpecially the ſixth.

The followers of *Artemon* the Heretick teaching matters not contained in the Scripture, profeſſed that ‘ § They did exerciſe them from their predeceſſors, ‘ yea from the Apoſtles, as *Euſebius* hath it in the ‘ 5 book of his Hiſtory chap. the 25.

St. *Auguſtin* writing upon St. *John* at his 97. Treatiſe, hath theſe words: ‘ ‡ The moſt ſenſeleſs ‘ Hereticks, who would be called Chriſtians, ſtrive to ‘ colour their bold inventions (which are abhorred by ‘ human ſenſe) with the pretext of this evangelical ſen- ‘ tence, where our Lord ſpeaketh, I have yet many things ‘ to tell you, but you cannot bear them at this time.’ As if theſe were the ſame things which the Apoſtles could not then carry, we ſhall not therefore affront or wrong Cardinal *Bellarmin*, if we rank him amongſt thoſe, which *Auguſtin* calleth *moſt ſenſeleſs Hereticks*, ſeeing that he ſpeaketh as theſe Hereticks, imploying the ſame quotation to prove Romiſh Traditions, ſpeaking thus in the 5. chapter of his book of the unwritten word: ‘ * It is proved by teſtimony of Scrip- ‘ ture, that there are ſome true Traditions, the firſt ‘ teſtimony is at the 16. of St. *John:* I have many ‘ things to tell you, &c ’ Thus have the antient Hereticks no want at all of Diſciples.

---

§ Φασὶ γαρ τοὺς μὲν πρεσβυτέρους ἁπαντας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀποστόλους παρειληφέναι καὶ διδιδαχέναι ταῦτα ἃ νῦν λέγουσι.

‡ Omnes inſipientiſſimi hæretici audacias figmentorum ſuorum quas maximè exhorret ſenſus humanus, hac occaſione Evangelicæ ſententiæ colorare nituntur, ubi Dominus ait, adhuc multa habeo vobis dicere ſed non poteſtis portare modo, quaſi hæc ipſa ſint quæ tunc diſcipuli portare non poterant.

* Eſſe aliquas veras traditiones probatur teſtimoniis Scripturarum. Primum eſt Johan. 16. Multa habeo vobis dicere, ſed non poteſtis portare modo.

CHAP. XVII. *An examination of the paſſages of Scripture, whereon they found Traditions.*

OUR Adverſaries ground the authority of the Scripture upon unwritten Tradition, whence it followeth (if they had but reaſon for it) that unwritten Tradition is not grounded upon the Scripture: they conteſt therefore againſt themſelves, when they endeavour to ground Tradition upon the Scripture, but let us hear their proofs.

In imitation of the antient Hereticks, they alledge theſe words of our Lord Jeſus to his Apoſtles, at the 16. of St. *John*, verſe 12. *I have yet more things to tell you, &c.* This is the paſſage that ſerved the antient Hereticks turn, to prove their Traditions, as *Tertul.* witneſſeth in his book of Preſcriptions, Chap. 22. ſuch imaginations (if men would believe them) are, the ſucceſſion of the Pope in the Apoſtleſhip of St. *Peter*; invocation of Saints, ſervice to images, the power of the Pope to draw ſouls out of Purgatory, *&c.* And they pronounce this without any proof, ſave only becauſe their ſelves do ſay it, and the Pope will have it ſo to be, unto whom theſe Traditions are very gainful; but we had rather believe in Jeſus Chriſt, who expoundeth himſelf in the ſame place: For at the verſe following he declareth to his Diſciples, that the ſpirit of truth ſhould approach, and teach them *the things to come*, that is to ſay, the future events of things foretold in the Epiſtles written by the Apoſtles; as for example, * that there ſhould ariſe falſe Doctors, teaching to abſtain from marriage and victual; and that † the ſon of perdition ſhould name himſelf God, and ſhould practiſe with ſigns and miracles to ſeduce; and that ‡ the great Whore cloathed in ſcarlet, ſitting in a Town of ſeven mountains, ſhould intoxicate Kings and glut her-

---

* 1. Tim. 4. † 2. Theſſ. 2. ‡ Apoc. 17.

ſelf

ſelf with the blood of the faithful, &c. As alſo the eſtate and condition of the Chriſtian Church, and of the ſpiritual kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, which the Apoſtles did not as then fully comprehend.

Above all, they preſs the 15. verſe of the ſecond chapter of the ſecond to the *Theſſalonians: Therefore (brethren) ſtand faſt, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epiſtle.*

The word * *Tradition* which the Apoſtle maketh uſe of, doth purport and ſignify all inſtruction. In this ſenſe the Scripture itſelf is a Tradition, as we have already proved.

As touching this paſſage, our adverſaries do infer that beſides the Epiſtle which S. *Paul* wrote to the *Theſſalonians*, he had uttered unto them many things by word of mouth: unto which I ſhall willingly condeſcend; for we would not maintain that the firſt Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, contained all the doctrine of ſalvation; our diſpute is not whether a little Epiſtle of Saint *Paul*, but whether the old and new Teſtament contain all that is neceſſary to ſalvation; therefore this paſſage is not to purpoſe.

Moreover, when the ſame Apoſtle did ſay, *Hold the traditions which you have learned by our word, or by the holy Scriptures*, it muſt not be thereupon concluded, that the myſteries which he had told them, were others than thoſe that are written: for the ſame thing may be taught by divers means.

And when the precepts delivered by the Apoſtles mouth, had ſome diſparity with thoſe that are written, we could ſay that ſuch things flowing from the Apoſtles mouths (over and above that which is found in the Scriptures) were not points of Faith, but Ordinances touching Eccleſiaſtical policy.

Yea when we ſhall have yielded to our adverſaries all that they wiſh and long for, yet is all fruitleſs and nothing done by them, unleſs they prove that theſe

* παραδοσις.

Traditions, which they ſay were given to the *Theſſalonians* by mouth, are the points whereof conſiſteth our controverſy: to wit, the *Pope's Supremacy* over the Church of the whole world, *Romiſh* Indulgences, ſingle life of Prieſts, the Communion under one kind, borrowed Satisfactions, a reſtraint of reading the Scripture, Maſſes without Communicants, Prayers wherein the Petitioner underſtandeth nothing, the power of the Pope to releaſe ſouls out of Purgatory, and to depoſe Kings, *&c.* which are Traditions of a new impreſſion, and which the Church of the *Theſſalonians* (yet ſubſiſting, and hath ſo continued ſince the Apoſtle Saint *Paul*) did never believe, nor as yet alloweth of their validity, but deſieth them with all loathing and deteſtation.

Saint *Ambroſe* in his Commentary upon this place, by the *Tradition* whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh underſtands the doctrine of the Goſpel, which our Adverſaries would not deny to be contained in the New Teſtament: * "To the end (ſaith he, that the foreknow- * ledge of God ſhould remain in their ſalvation; he * admoniſheth them to ſtand faſt, and perſevere in the * tradition of the Goſpel.

I am of opinion I ſhall prevent our Adverſaries, from interrupting me more in the paſſages which they alledge. Saint *Paul* ſaith, *We ſpake Wiſdom amongſt thoſe that are perfect*, 1. Cor. 2. 6. *And again have before thine eyes, and hold faſt the pattern or form of ſound words, which thou haſt heard of me*, 2. Tim. 1. 13. In a third place, *now I praiſe you that you remember me in all things, and keep my Ordinances, as I delivered them unto you*, 1. Cor. 11. 2. *Ergo* (for ſo they conclude) the things which are preached are differing from thoſe that are written. And what are the things? Invocation of Saints, Service to Images, *&c.* In all this what a defect there is of common ſenſe? The Jawbone of *Samſon's* Aſs, or *Tobie's* dog might be as well employed.

---

* Ut præſcientia Dei maneat in ſalute illorum, idcirco in traditione Evangelii ſtandum ac perſeverandum monet.

Con-

Concerning the words in the 16. of the *Acts* at the 4. *That* Paul *and* Silas, *paſſing through the Cities, inſtructed them to keep the Ordinances decreed by the Apoſtles, and by the Elders of* Jeruſalem: In theſe Ordinances are underſtood, the reſtraints of eating blood, and ſtrangled creatures whereof mention is made in *Acts* the 15. for in this voyage *Paul* and *Silas* were bearers of this Ordinance: and *Paul* was expreſly ſent to perform the ſame. Now, this Ordinance is written, as alſo the alteration was made ſince the Apoſtles time; and it is but a Ceremony ordained for a time, and not a doctrine neceſſary to ſalvation: and when ſome Ordinances ſhould be here underſtood, how ſhall it be proved unto us, that theſe Ordinances are others than thoſe that are written? how ſhall it be proved unto us, that theſe ordinances were invocation of Saints, adoration of Reliques, the Pope's Supremacy, *&c.* This will never be proved.

CHAP. XVIII. *An anſwer to that which is objected unto us, that the Church hath been ſometime without the Scripture.*

TO undervalue the authority of the Scripture, and to make it unneceſſary, it is objected unto us, that the Church from the creation until *Moſes*, for the ſpace of 2454 years, hath been without the Scripture. And that (as *Irenæus* is witneſs) from the time of the Apoſtles and their Diſciples, ſome nations whereunto the writings of the Apoſtles were not yet at that time come, have not omitted to conſerve the purity of the Goſpel.

To which we anſwer, that when God ſpeaketh from Heaven, or ſendeth Angels to inſtruct men concerning his will, the Scripture might eaſily be neglected: if at this Day God ſpoke from heaven, and publiſhed his Oracles from above, as he ſpoke heretofore to the Fathers and Patriarchs before *Moſes*, we ſhould not ſeek for any other inſtruction. But this is no more; and God having fully imparted his will unto us, by the

writings of his Prophets and Apoſtles, we are obliged to follow the means, wherewith his goodneſs hath furniſhed us, and it is neceſſary to be bound and compelled thereunto.

I ſay, the ſame of the Church in the Apoſtles time, whilſt it was clearly illuminated by the preaching and miracles of ſo renowned inſtruments of the holy Spirit, who were inſtructed by God in all verity; thoſe people which were taught by their mouth, made no great eſteem of their writings: but God having inſpired them to leave in writing the effect of his will, wherein he had well tutor'd them, and they having not left behind them one perſon of like authority and knowledge, nor that hath the Spirit of God in equal meaſure; nothing remaineth more for us, but to be inſtructed by their writings, wherein the Apoſtles ſpeak unto us, and their word is yet alive and full of efficacy ſince their death and departure.

It is a profane preſumption, or affected negligence, to ſpeak of theſe writings (divinely inſpired) as of unneceſſary ſcripts and ſcroles: for they which talk that language, do it for this end, to withdraw the people from the holy reading thereof, as from a frivolous buſineſs, and for the end to diſtribute the rules therein contained unattentively and in hugger-mugger. Shall we call them unneceſſary means, which God hath choſen to inform us concerning his will? The which if they were not abſolutely neceſſary of their own nature, yet they are made altogether neceſſary by the will of God, and by the counſel of his providence: for he hath left but this infallible means to inſtruct us. And men that ſpeak in the Chairs may err, they are likewiſe ſubject to avarice and ambition, the two ports through which errors do enter by troops and throngs, the Paſtors ever accommodating religion to their profit.

And truly whoſoever ſhall know what was the eſtate of the *Romiſh* Church, ſome ſix ſcore years paſſed, and how it conſiſted only in fabulous Legends, in adoration of Reliques, in miracles made by images, in vertues and perfections of the Frock or Cowl of S. *Francis*

and

and Saint *Dominick*; and that Jeſus Chriſt ſcarce appeared amongſt the Saints, and that the holy Scripture was utterly eſtranged and unknown; will eaſily acknowledge, that the main bar which hath hindred Papiſtry, that it ſhould not paſs into Paganiſm, (whereinto it was running poſt) hath been, that theſe holy Books were drawn forth of dark ignorance, and tranſlated into the vulgar Tongues. He will (I ſay) acknowledge that the people of the *Romiſh* Church owe unto us that little knowledge which remaineth with them, and that we have diminiſhed their ſervitude.

CHAP. XIX. *That the Church of the Old Teſtament, after the Law given by* Moſes *until Jeſus Chriſt, hath had no unwritten Traditions.*

TO the maintenance and increaſe of their Traditions, our Adverſaries do joyn ſome examples of them, which they ſay have been received in the Church of the old Teſtament, without form of Scripture, ſince the Law written by *Moſes*.

* Cardinal *Perron* putteth forward ſome hiſtories, and certain commandments made to particular men: as the commandment to carry the Ark of the Covenant in proceſſion; the transferring of the Ark of God, from *Shilo* to another place; the charge made to *Solomon*, to build a Temple; and yet nevertheleſs the firſt of them is found in the 3 *chap.* of *Joſhua, verſe* the 3. and 6. the ſecond at the 78. *Pſalm verſe* the 60. the third in the 2. of *Sam. chap. the* 7. *verſe the* 13. and 1. of *Kings* 5. 5. So little was this Cardinal verſed in God's book. And though theſe paſſages were not found in the Scripture, yet could it not be prejudicial to us; for they are Hiſtories and commandments, made to particular men, not rules and doctrines of Religion.

* Du Perron contre le Roy de la Grand Bretagne, Pag. 776.

Alſo he objecteth unto us (and others after him) the immortality of the ſoul, which they ſay appeareth not in the five books of *Moſes*; theſe men without doubt ſcarce turn over the ſacred Pages of the Scripture. At the 23. *chap.* of *Numbers*, *Balaam* ſpeaketh. *Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my laſt end be like unto theirs.* He that calleth death a diſſolution, acknowledgeth that the ſoul ſurviveth the body; and he that accompteth the death of the Righteous to be bliſsful, doth not believe that their ſouls periſh, as they do of Beaſts. At the 59 *chapter of* Geneſis, *verſe* the 18 *Jacob* dying, ſpeaketh. *O eternal, I have underſtood thy ſalvation.* And at the 35. of *Gen.* 18. it is ſaid of *Rachel* dying, *and as her ſoul was in departing.* Which perpetuity cannot be ſaid of ſouls in Beaſts, for they periſh with the body. At the 31. of *Deut.* 16. God ſpeaking to *Moſes*, *Behold thou ſhalt keep with thy Fathers.* Which doth fully make good, that the ſouls have their repoſe after death. Never did man in his right wits call the eſtate of ſome horſe after death, a ſleep. At the 47 of *Geneſ.* *Jacob* calleth his life in this world, and that of his fathers a pilgrimage, and acknowledgeth himſelf a ſtranger in the world. The Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, chap. 11. 14. declareth, that *they which ſay ſuch things, declare plainly that they ſeek a country, that is to ſay, a celeſtial one*, as it appeareth by the 16. verſe. Jeſus Chriſt at the 22 of S. *Matthew* to the ſame purpoſe (and to prove the Reſurrection) alledgeth the words of God himſelf, at the 3. of *Exodus*; *I am the God of Abraham, the God of* Iſaac, *the God of* Jacob: *For* (ſaith he) *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* But what moveth theſe men to perſwade, that the immortality of the ſoul is not found at all in the books of the Law of God, except it be becauſe they themſelves doubt of it? or becauſe they endeavour to make the Sacred books contemptible, as failing in a point, without the which, the ſame that is called Religion, is a mere ſallacy and impoſture, and all the ſervice of God, is a ſuperfluous toil and care.

* To the same purpose they add, that the resurrection of Bodies, the final judgment, Paradise and Hell, are not contained evidently in all the Old Testament, whereby it appeareth, that the whole study of these men, is to read only the writings of their doctors, in copying forth their reasons, without the pains of coming to the source, which is, to finger over the leaves of the Scriptures, for when should we have done collecting together the passages of the Old Testament, which speaks of these things? The very Psalms alone might suffice; and consider with me some passages among the rest, *Psal.* 16. 12. *Thou shalt shew me the path of Life, in thy presence is the fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there is pleasure for evermore.* And at the 17 *Psal.* 16. *I will behold thy presence in righteousness, and when I awake up after thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it.* God's face is not to be seen with satiety, but after the last alarm of the resurrection. And in the 49th *Psal.* 16. *God shall redeem my Soul from the Tyranny of Hell,* (meaning of death) *When he shall take me unto him.* and at the 73 *Psal.* 23. *Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and after that receive me with glory.* At the 31 *Psal.* 6. *Into thy hands I commend my Spirit, for thou hast redeemed me, O Lord thou God of truth.* At the 50th *Psal.* 3, 4, 5. *Our God shall come, having a consuming fire before him, and a mighty tempest shall be stirred up round about him; he shall call the Heaven from above, and the Earth, that he may judge his people,* saying, *Gather my Saints together unto me,* &c. At the 102 *Psal.* 26. *The Heavens shall perish but thou shalt endure.* The Prophet *Daniel* at the 12. 2. *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the Earth shall awake some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt.* At the 26 of *Esaiah* 19. *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise; awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust.* At the Chap. 65, ver. 17. *Behold I create new Heavens,*

* John Jaubert chap. 26. p. 324.

and

and new Earth; and the former ſhall not be remembred, nor come into mind. *Job* at the 19, the 25, 26, 27. ſpeaketh amply of the coming of his Redeemer upon the Earth, and of his reſurrection, after his body ſhall be devoured with worms, and of the aſſurance he hath to ſee God one day with his eyes. The Prophet *Eſaiah*, at the 66. pronounceth this of reprobates, *Their worm never dieth, and their fire ſhall never be extinguiſhed.* *Balaam* deſiring to dye the death of the juſt, at the 23 of *Numb.* 10. accompteth the death of the wicked to be wretched and woeful. Theſe paſſages as I conceive are expreſs and punctual concerning Paradiſe, the reſurrection, the torment of the damned, and the eternal Judgment.

They offer yet more, that in the Book of the Old Teſtament, no mention is made of the Creation, nor of degrees of Angels, nor of the Creation and eſſence or being of devils; which nevertheleſs are points clearly found to be therein, as in *Job* 2. 1. and at the 38. 7. the Angels are called the ſons of God, whereupon it followeth, that God is their Father, and that he hath formed them, and when the Scripture ſaith, *Let the Angels do worſhip to him*, Pſal. 97. 7. And *let them execute his commandment, and obey his word*, Pſal, 103. 20. It preſuppoſeth that God created them, for if God had not created them, injuſtice would have been laid to his charge, for uſurping an imperial dominion over the workmanſhip of another power. Yea this alone, wherein the Scripture affirmeth, that there are Angels, is ſufficient to prove, that God created them, for it is impoſſible that they ſhould create themſelves.

As for the degrees of Angels it is a mere vanity for any man to diſtil and conſume the brain therein; It concerneth neither faith nor morality.

And for the eſſence of devils, the Old Teſtament ſufficiently doth determine it, in ſaying, that there are devils. He that confeſſeth there is a Sun (preſuppoſeth the Sun hath a being) and there is no neceſſity that we ſhould be ſkilled in the knowledge of their nature. As for their fall, ſeeing God hath made nothing

thing but what is very good, the 1 of *Genes.* 31. It followeth that these evil Spirits in the beginning were good, and consequently that they are lapsed from their integrity, how, and by what occasions, or by what degrees they are fallen, are matters which God hath not revealed, for they are not reputed necessary to salvation.

* They also report many Histories, which they say are not found written in the Old Testament. As for example, 'the Magicians which withstood *Moses* were 'called ‡ *Jannes* and *Jambres*;' that *Moses* being at the foot of the mountain, spoke, '§ *I exceedingly fear and* '*tremble.*' † The placing of the Censer in the Ark of the Covenant, and the combat of *Michael* ‡‡ the Archangel with Satan, for the body of *Moses*. Which are not rules either of good belief or good life, but only histories of things happened, wherein consisteth not the substance of our salvation.

As much may be said of some ceremonies practised in *Israel* once or oftner, but not ordinary or indifferent customs in their nature, as washing of the feet before they went to eat of the *Paschal Lamb*, which was a custom that the *Jews* ordinarily observed before the repast. And the mixture of water with blood, for the purification of the people, (as the Apostle intimateth to the *Hebrews*, at the 10 chap.) which was not a law in the antient Church, but a ceremony practised once by *Moses*.

They also object unto us some depraved and lewd customs, as the pardon of a capital malefactor at the feast of *Easter*, though he be a murtherer, a custom contrary to the law of God, *Numb.* 35. 31. and some other scrupulous and vain observations, as was that custom of not journeying above two miles on the Sabbath; grounded upon an act of ‖ *Joshua* passing over *Jordan*, when he kept the people at distance

---

* Du Perron liv. contre le Roy de la grand Bretagne p. 776.
‡ 2. Tim. 3. 8. § Hebr. 12. 21. † Hebr. 9. 4.
‡‡ Jude 9. ‖ Josh. 3. 4.

from

from the Ark of the Covenant, being removed from thence about two thouſand cubits by meaſure. We are well contented that our adverſaries uphold their Traditions, with ſuch poor and unworthy examples.

Some of them thinking to be more ſubtle, object unto us that in the books of the Old Teſtament, three things are wanting which are neceſſary to Salvation.

There is not found (ſay they) a remedy in the Old Teſtament, that God hath provided to purge and cleanſe the feminine ſex from original ſin, for none are circumciſed but the males. * I anſwer that our Adverſaries themſelves do not believe, that original ſin was taken away by vertue of circumciſion, but by the faith of the Parents applied to the Children by form of impetration, and by the merit of him that circumciſeth. For they hold that circumciſion did not juſtify, nor confer grace, but only that it was a ſign of grace, and not neceſſary to ſalvation.

The Jeſuit *Vaſques* ſpeaking of Children, that under the law of *Moſes* died without being circumciſed, ſaith, '† If a Child died without any Sacrament, there 'was no hurt therein, for it was not conducible 'and neceſſary to ſalvation.' It is certain that remiſſion of original ſin is neceſſary to ſalvation. Wherefore I ſay that original ſin was remitted and forgiven, as well to the male as to the female people of *Iſrael*; by vertue of the alliance which God had contracted with *Abraham*, ſaying, *I ſhall be thy God, and to thy poſterity after thee*, *Geneſ.* 17. 7. for women were alſo of the poſterity of *Abraham*.

The circumciſion of the Males was ſufficient to ſignify that all the people were taken into confederation with God, to diſcern God's people from the

---

* Vide Thomam par. 3. q. 70. & in eam Vaſquez & de Valentia.

† *Vaſquez in Thom. partem* 3. *Diſp.* 163. *cap.* 2. Neque incommodum aliquod erat pueros ſine Sacramento decedere, cum illud ad ſalutem non eſſet neceſſarium.

other

other nations. And for this, there needed no ſuch particular ſign or token in the women. The *Jews* writing of their Traditions, ſpeak nothing of ſuch a ſign or Sacrament, nor have our Adverſaries produced any.

They ſay in the ſecond place, that the *Iſraelites* to be ſaved were to believe, that the ſacrifices were not ſufficient of themſelves to expiate the ſins, but that they drew their vertue from the death of Jeſus Chriſt, and that thoſe which did eat of the Paſchal-Lamb, were to have reſpect to Jeſus Chriſt, and to underſtand the ſignification of this Lamb. Now (ſay theſe men) they could not learn this from the books of *Moſes*, nor from the Prophets; therefore they learnt it by the unwritten Tradition.

In ſpeaking thus they falſify the words of the Apoſtle Saint *Peter*, who at the 10th of the *Acts* 43. ſaith, that *To Jeſus Chriſt all the Prophets give witneſs, that through his name whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins.* And they contradict Saint *Paul*, who at the 26th of the *Acts* 22. ſaith of himſelf, *that he ſpeaketh no other things then thoſe, which the Prophets and* Moſes *did foretel ſhould come to paſs.* They alſo abuſe themſelves to think, that it was then neceſſary to every one of the faithful, to have a clear inſight, and underſtanding of the ſacrifices of the law, and of the Paſchal Lamb; for the faithful are not bound to believe of Jeſus Chriſt, more than that which God by his word hath revealed unto them. If any one about the Time of *Moſes*, offering ſacrifice according to the law, were not inſtructed in the doctrine of the death of our Redeemer, but only believed, that God through the means which he knoweth to be moſt agreeable and convenient, will forgive us our treſpaſſes, it were raſhneſs to go about to exclude ſuch a man from Salvation, and it is certain, that then the faithful were not without inſtruction, as touching this point, for they were prompted by the Scriptures, to expect this ſeed of the Woman, which ſhould cruſh the head of the Serpent, and the

ſeed

seed of *Abraham*, wherein all Nations should be blessed.

Cardinal *Perron* is advised of a third Tradition, not written in the Old Testament, which nevertheless (if we could believe it) was necessary to Salvation. He supposeth that it was necessary for the *Jews* to believe, that the fire of their sacrifices (after the captivity) was descended from Heaven, and that the same continual fire which was upon the Altar, was conserved by miracle, during the transmigration. † Whereupon I say that this miraculous conservation of the fire being but a Judaical fable, the *Jews* were not bound to believe it. The charge of the Sacrificers, was to put the fire upon the Altar, as it is said, *Levit.* 1. 7. * The Sons of *Aaron*, *Nadab*, and *Abihu*, did sin, not because they placed strange fire upon the Altar, but in putting into their Censers, the fire which they took from elsewhere, and not from off the Altar, *Levit.* 10. 1. Look upon the 8 of the *Apoc.* 5. Moreover, put the case this fable were admitted for true, yet it is not a rule of Religion, nor a doctrine of Faith, but only a mere History, whereof whosoever had been ignorant, had not incurred eternal damnation.

And admit that under the Old Testament, the Church had unwritten Traditions, it should not therefore follow, that it was lawful for the Church of *Rome* to forge new ones, and to equal them in authority to the writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

CHAP. XX. *An answer to our Adversaries affirming, that we receive many Traditions contained in the Scripture.*

OUR Adversaries upbraid us, in that we who reject Traditions, are nevertheless constrained to

† 2 Macc. 1.

* Hac de re vide Rabbi Shelomo in ca. 1 Aggæi Talmud Tractatu Jukasin 1 fol. 21. Rabbi Moshe Ben Meimon tractat. de עלית תמידים admit

admit of many. Ye believe, (ſay they) that theſe books were canonical, ye allow of baptiſing ſuch as are Hereticks, and the baptiſm of little infants; ye believe the proceſſion of the holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and the tranſlation of the Sabbath to the dominical day, and the perpetual virginity of *Mary* the mother of Chriſt; ye believe that women ought to ſing in the Church, ye grant the words of Conſubſtantiation, of Trinity, of Perſon, and of Sacrament, which are not found in the holy Scripture.

I have already ſaid, that we reject not all unwritten Traditions; but only thoſe which add ſomething to the doctrine of Salvation, contained in holy Scriptures. For anſwer to their objection, that we receive this unwritten Tradition, to wit, 'Theſe books 'are canonical;' to ſay ſo much of the books, is not to add to the canonical books. And ſpeaking in that manner, we are ſo far from adding to Scripture, that on the contrary, it is a declaration that nothing is to be added thereunto, and that it is the perfect rule of our faith. Yet to have a complete certainty of the ſacredneſs of theſe books, there muſt be a ſtronger teſtimony than this Tradition. An illiterate man not inſtructed in the knowledge of God, receiveth the teſtimony of the Church of his own country, which telleth him that theſe books are canonical, as a probable teſtimony, and which he ſhould not willingly contradict; but then he beginneth to have of it a divine teſtimony, and of ſovereign efficacy, when the Spirit of God by the doctrine contained in this Scripture, hath enlightened his ſpirit, and inflamed his heart with a ſecret virtue, whereof it is in vain to diſpute with thoſe that feel it not; the which cannot ſerve for a law to another, but ſerveth to every one of the faithful in particular, to aſſure his conſcience. It is alſo to be conſidered, that the teſtimony of ſhewing ſuch and ſuch books to be canonical, might proceed as well from an heretical as from an orthodox Church. The Apoſtles received

ceived the holy Scripture from the Phariſees and Sacrificers, who were enemies to Jeſus Chriſt. Whence it appeareth, that the teſtimony which the Church affordeth to the Scriptures, is not of ſupreme authority and indubitable, but invalid. It is by faith that we believe, that the contents of the Scripture are the word of God; which faith is not given by the Church, for it is an effect of the Spirit of God.

Touching the other points I ſpeak of them in general, that if they be doctrines and rules of the Chriſtian faith, not contained in the Scripture, we are not bound to believe them. But when every one of theſe points ſhall be examined aſunder, ſome will be found contained in the Scripture, others are not doctrines, nor laws or rules of the Chriſtian Faith, nor things requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation.

I am aſtoniſhed to behold how our Adverſaries dare to inſert the baptiſm of little Infants, amongſt the unwritten Traditions, ſeeing that their ſelves diſputing againſt the Anabaptiſts, prove it by many paſſages of Scripture *Bellarmin* in his eighth Chapter of the firſt Book of Baptiſm, bringeth theſe proofs of Scripture, that Baptiſm ſucceeded Circumciſion, which was applied to little Infants. That Jeſus Chriſt at the ninth of Saint *Matthew*, ſaith, *Suffer the little ones to come to me, &c.* That in the 16th of the *Acts*, *Lydia* is baptized by Saint *Paul* with all her houſe. And that in the ſame Chapter, the ſame Apoſtle baptizeth all the family of the Goaler. That Saint *Paul* baptized the family of *Stephanus*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. If theſe proofs are bad, why do they make uſe of them? If they be good in their mouths, why ſhould they not be good in ours?

As for holding Baptiſm of Hereticks to be good, we account not this Article as neceſſary to Salvation. *Agrippine*, a man of holy life and doctrine, and St. *Cyprian*, Saint *Firmilian*, Saint *Denis*, *Alexandrine*, and Saint *Baſil* have diſſented in this point, from the Church of *Rome*; yet nevertheleſs they are held for Saints by our Adverſaries. Yea more, many Councils approved by the Church of *Rome* ordain, that ſome Hereticks

Hereticks ſhould be re-baptized, by name the *Paulianiſts*, the *Samoſetanians*, the *Montaniſts*, the *Eunomians*, the *Sabellians*, the *Eucratites*, *&c.* as is to be ſeen at the ninteenth Canon of the firſt Council of *Nice*. At the eighth Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*. At the ſeventh Canon of the firſt Council of *Conſtantinople*. And in the Epiſtle of Saint *Baſil* to *Amphilochius* at the forty-ſeventh Canon.

Yet this queſtion ſhall be found decided in the Scripture by all probability. For Circumciſion did ſtill continue among the *Iſraelites*, of the ten idolatrous races, who were no more circumciſed, when they were converted to the true Religion. The cuſtom of circumciſing the *Samaritans* again that were ranged into Judaiſm, (whereof *Epiphanius* ſpeaketh in his book of meaſures and weights) practiſed upon *Symmachus* a Traducer of the Scriptures, was invented afterwards. The ſame reaſon is for Baptiſm.

Concerning the proceſſion of the holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, it is to be ſeen in the Council of *Florence*, that the *Latins* defending themſelves againſt the *Greeks* upon this queſtion, do alledge Scripture; but this controverſy was deviſed, and is ſuſtained with animoſity, to ſtrengthen the Schiſm, and it is an eaſy matter to accord them therein. For thoſe who ſay that the holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father by the Son, do ſay alſo that it proceedeth from the Father and the Son. In a matter that paſſeth our capacities, it is better to ſay little than too much, and rather to be ignorant than to conteſt.

The change of the Sabbath and obſervation of the Lord's day, are plainly enough collected out of the Scripture. The Apoſtle to the *Coloſ.* 2. 16. ſaying, *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in reſpect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days*, forbiddeth to condemn any man that doth not obſerve a diſtinction of meats, and keepeth not the new Moons, nor Sabbaths. And by the placing of new Moons and the Sabbaths in the ſame rank, he ſheweth clearly, that as Chriſtians were not obliged to keep the new Moons, ſo were they no more ſtrict-

ly

ly bound to keep the Sabbaths. At the firſt chapter of the *Apoc.* 10. is mention made of our Lord's-day. Upon which paſſage the Jeſuit *Ribera* ſpeaketh thus, ' * We ſee here that in the time of the Apoſtles, ' the ſolemnity of the Sabbath was changed to the ' Lord's-day.' This is the firſt day of the week whereon the Chriſtians made their ſolemn aſſemblies, to celebrate the holy Supper, and to contribute their alms, as is to be ſeen at the 20th of the *Acts* 7. and in 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. as *Thomas* and *Lombard* have declared in their Commentaries upon this Epiſtle, and after them one *Eſtius*, ſpeaking thus; ' † The Church from that ' time began to call it the Lord's-day, becauſe on that ' day the Lord was raiſed from the dead. For it is ' ſo called by St. *John*, at the firſt of the *Apocalypſe*; ' wherefore it is not to be doubted, but that the name ' and inſtitution of the Lord's-day, ought to be fa- ' thered upon the Apoſtles.' Nevertheleſs, let us grant that no mention is made of this in the Scripture, what availeth it againſt us, who affirm that all the doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, are contained in the Scripture? For the obſervation of our Lord's-day is not a doctrine, but a law of eccleſiaſtical government.

The perpetual virginity of the bleſſed Virgin, is believed in our Churches by way of decency; though it be not a doctrine of Faith, nor a point neceſſary to Salvation. *Baſil* in his homily of the Nativity of Chriſt, ſaith, ' That if it were otherwiſe, yet would ' it be nothing prejudicial to our Salvation.' Howſoever, *Helvidius* had not his perfect ſenſes about him,

---

* *Ribera in cap.* 1. *Apocal.* Videmus hic etiam tempore Apoſtolorum Sabbathi ſolemnitatem mutatam eſſe in Dominicam diem.

† *Eſtius Comment. in* 1. *Corin. cap.* 17. Eccleſia jam ab illo tempore cœpit vocare diem Dominicam, quod in ea reſurrexiſſet Dominus à morte. Sic enim appellatur à Johanne Apoſtolo Apocal. 1. ut proinde dies Dominica nomen & inſtitutionem ad Apoſtolos referendam eſſe non ſit dubium.

‡ ὑπόνοιαν παρίχειτὰ νομισμένα τῷ γάμῳ ἔργα μὴ ἀπαρηναμένης μαρίας. ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ σὺς μηδὲν τῷ τῆς ἐυσεβείας παραλυμαίνεται λόγῳ, &c.

to

to move ſo impertinent a queſtion, and call into doubt a matter, which were better ſuppoſed to be true, than argued on either ſide.

As for ſinging of Pſalms in our Churches, as well by men as by women, it is no article of the Chriſtian Faith, but an eccleſiaſtical policy and cuſtom, which neither addeth to, nor ſubtracteth from the doctrine of faith. And this cuſtom is not practiſed in all our Churches; for there are Churches which do aſſemble ſecretly, to avoid perſecution, as heretofore did Chriſtians under the Pagan Emperors. Theſe poor Churches have not the liberty of ſinging, yet are they not the leſs amiable in the ſight of God. The Apoſtle to the *Coloſ.* 3. 16. commandeth us to exhort one the other by Pſalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs. He wrote this to the *Coloſſians* without diſtinction of Sex. The ſame Apoſtle in 1 *Cor.* 14. 14. and at 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. forbiddeth women to teach in the Church, but not to ſing. For ſeeing they partake [1] of the prayers and preaching, why not of the praiſes and actions of thankſgiving? If it be a ſeemly thing and religious in them, to chant forth the glorious commendations of God in their houſe at home, why not alſo in the houſe of God?

The terms of *Conſubſtantiation* and *Trinity*, are words, but no rules nor doctrines; and theſe words as they add nothing to the Scripture, ſo they import nothing that is not contained in the Scripture in other terms. The term of perſon is found in *Heb.* 1. 3. for this word *Hypoſtaſis* in *Greek* ſignifieth *Perſon.*

They have but little modeſty who bluſh not to demand a paſſage of Scripture, where the word *Sacrament* may be found. The Apoſtles writing in *Greek*, regarded not to provide themſelves of a *Latin* word. Surely theſe men ſpeak as properly as if they enquired whether this very word *Horſe* is found in *Virgil.* In the *Latin* vulgar tranſlation the word *Sacramentum* is rehearſed ſome dozen of times, and ſignifieth a *myſtery* or *Secret.* Whence it cometh, that the myſtery of the great Whore, the ſignification of the ſeven ſtars, and the Senſe or expoſition of the dreams

dreams are called Sacraments. *Apoc.* 3. 1. and 17. 7. *Dan.* 2. 18.

Touching the holy Supper, which we call *Sacrament*, herein we follow the cuſtom, and by the word we underſtand no other thing, but that which Jeſus Chriſt calleth a memorial or commemoration, ſaying, *Do this in remembrance of me.*

CHAP. XXI. *A proof of the ſufficiency and perfection of the Scriptures, by the Teſtimony of God himſelf, ſpeaking in the Scriptures.*

WE have offered to your underſtandings, both the novelty, and falſhood of *Romiſh* Traditions, and have proved that they are neither divine, nor Apoſtolical. It is therefore to be concluded, that we ought intirely to adhere to the word of God, contained in the holy Scriptures: For in two ways, when the one is blocked up, there remaineth but the other that is paſſable. Our Adverſaries themſelves aid us in this point, The Popes having made ſo many decrees, and decretals, and extravagants; yet they dare not call theſe decrees *the word of God.* Yea, they produce no other book than the Scripture that beareth this title *the word of God*, or of the *Teſtament* or *Covenant of God.* This ſingle proof may ſuffice, unleſs we would embrace the word of men for a rule of Faith.

Our adverſaries again tell us, that the Holy Scripture cannot teſtify of it ſelf, and when it is called Holy and Divine. § 'It is no more to be credited 'than *Titus Livius*, or *Mahomet*'s Alcoran.' But let them know that this is God's true Prerogative, to be Judge and witneſs in her cauſe, who being the party offended will not forget at the laſt day to be Judge of thoſe that have offended him. Hearken to that of

---

§ Baile Jeſuite au 1. traité de ſon Catechiſm. Belarm lib. 4. de Verbo Dei, cap. 4. §. Quarto.

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt, ſpeaking at the 8. of St. *John* 14. *Though I bear record of my ſelf, yet my record is true, and worthy to be believed* For God is not therefore to be the leſs believed, becauſe there are ſo many incredulous and unbelieving; and the perverſity of man ſhall never deſpoil God of his right. It is a *non ſequitur*, and an unjuſt inference that becauſe of the malice and depravedneſs of man, the dominion of God ſhould ſuffer diminution. Therefore we will not fear to alledge the Scripture, for proof of the perfection of the Scripture; We know that the authentick Teſtimony which God giveth to his word, can be no way taxed, or juſtly ſuſpected.

The Apoſtle St. *Paul*, in the 2 to *Tim.* 3. 15. ſpeaketh thus to his diſciple *Timothy*. *From thine infancy thou haſt known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto ſalvation, through faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Now what need we ſeek any further than to be ſo inſtructed, as that we may be able to attain unto ſalvation by our belief in Jeſus Chriſt?

To ſhift off this paſſage of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*, our Adverſaries tell us, that St. *Paul* ſpeaketh not in that place, but only of the books of the old Teſtament; and yet at that time the greateſt part of the new was written. But I am contented to grant what they ſay, for it maketh againſt them: being aſſured that if the ſole books of the old Teſtament can make a man wiſe to ſalvation, much more, and with ſtronger reaſon ſhall the old and the new coupled together, make us wiſe to ſalvation. The Holy Scripture never ſaith, that unwritten Traditions can make us wiſe to ſalvation. The Apoſtle had never ſaid that the Scripture can make us wiſe to ſalvation, if it inſtructed us but by halves, and if it were needful for us to ſeek the other part of our inſtruction, in another word that is unwritten.

Where they ſay that *Timothy* could not learn out of the old Teſtament, the immortality of the ſoul, nor *Paradiſe*, nor the reſurrection, *&c.* It hath been formerly confuted. Of the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt,

and

and of his death, the Prophets ſpeak moſt clearly and all the ſacrifices lead thereunto. And when theſe things were leſs plainly and expreſly ſet down, yet God required not of our Forefathers (before the coming of Chriſt) a greater knowledge, than that which was revealed unto them.

There are thoſe who play the Sophiſters upon this word, σοφίσαι, uſed by the Apoſtle, and do render it *to inſtruct*, and not *to make wiſe*. * Wherein their own Bible teacheth the contrary, for at the 19. *Pſal.* 7. There is in the Greek, σοφίζουσα νήπια, which is the vulgar tranſlation *Sapientiam præſtans parvulis*, that is to ſay, *giving wiſdom to the ſimple*. And at the 119. *Pſal.* 98. ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου ἐσόφισάς με, Where *Pagnin* rendreth it, *tu me ſapientiorem reddidiſti inimicis meis. Thou haſt made me wiſer then mine enemies.* But upon the point it cometh all to one: for it ſufficeth us to be inſtructed to ſalvation, Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh not of any curtail'd or half inſtruction. He is inſtructed to ſalvation, who hath ſufficient inſtruction to be ſaved: and whoſoever is not wiſe to ſalvation, is not inſtructed to ſalvation; ſo are they one and the ſame thing. But if the Scripture could make *Timothy* wiſe to ſalvation, why ſhould it not be as well ſufficient to make others wiſe to ſalvation? For if any man profit therein leſs than *Timothy*, the reaſon is not, becauſe it is more perfect for one than for another; but becauſe one bringeth to it more light of ſpirit, more affection, and more attention than another: and becauſe God conferreth his knowledge more abundantly upon thoſe that fear him, and humbly crave the gift of underſtanding.

2. The Apoſtle St. *Paul* at 1 *Cor.* 4. 6. limiting the power of the Paſtors of the Church, ſaith, † *Let no man think above that which is written*, there it is,

---

* Phauorini lexicon, σοφίζομαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδ. ἀντὶ τοῦ σοφὸς γίνομαι.

† μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γεγραπται φρονεῖν.

above

above that which is written, and not *above that which I have written*. And whoſoever imputeth to *Beza*, that he tranſlated it, ‡ *above that which I have written*, is a detracting Calumniator.

3. The ſame Apoſtle at *Act.* 26. 22. proteſteth, *He never taught any thing, ſave only ſuch things as the Prophets and* Moſes *had foretold ſhould come to paſs.* He then confined his preaching to the Scriptures. And he ſhall be a good Miniſter of Chriſt, who (after the example of St. *Paul*) ſhall be able to ſay, that he never taught any thing, except thoſe things which *Moſes* and the Prophets and Apoſtles (diſciples of the Prophets) have taught. If it be moreover objected, that St. *Paul* being reſtrained to the writings of the Prophets, it ſhall follow, that the writings of the Apoſtles, (who have written ſince the Prophets) are unprofitable. I will anſwer that the Apoſtles have written the ſame things that the Prophets have written, for as much as concerneth the ſubſtance of ſalvation, but they have added thereunto much more clearneſs and light.

4. Yet the ſame Apoſtle at *Act.* 20. 27. ſpeaketh to the *Epheſians, I have not ſhunned to declare unto you all the counſel of God.* Whereupon it followeth, that the eſſential things of faith, which *Salmeron* formerly told us were added ſince the Apoſtles time, and not taught of them either by mouth or by writing, are not of the counſel of God. Of which additions in matters of religion of the greateſt importance, we have already vouched many examples, eſpecially out of the confeſſion of our Adverſaries themſelves.

It would be impertinent to reply, that by the ſame reaſon it ſhould be ſaid, that the Goſpel of St. *John*, and the *Apocalypſe* are not of the council of God, becauſe they were not then written, when St. *Paul* ſaid, he had declared all the council of God. For theſe two books contain not any doctrine which

‡ Jehan. Jaubert. pa. 306.

is not to be found in the other books of the new Teſtament, and which the Apoſtles have not taught by mouth and by writing.

5. At *Deut.* 4. 2. and 12. 3. God ſpeaketh thus, *Ye ſhall not add to the word which I command you, neither ſhall you diminiſh ought from it.* He doth not ſay, you ſhall not change or alter any part, or you ſhall not teach any thing to the contrary: but you ſhall add nothing, and diminiſh nothing. As to diminiſh and defalk ſomething from the Law of God, is not to foiſt in a contrary commandment: ſo alſo to add doth not ſignify to impugn. Put the caſe it were not forbidden to add, and that it ſhould be ſpoken thus: *You ſhall change nothing of my word*, yet the Pope would ſtill be culpable of having infringed this reſtraint, by attributing to himſelf the power of changing the Laws and ordinances of God, and of diſpenſing againſt the Apoſtle. In the books of the hourly prayers of our Lady (according to the cuſtom of Rome) the ten Commandments of God are placed in the entrance. The third is couched in theſe terms, *Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath and feſtival days.* Can any thing be more plainly added to the Commandment of God? Therefore if it were prohibited to add to the Law of *Moſes* (without which was then no Doctrine of ſalvation) there is no colour or appearance that at this time the Law of *Moſes*, the Prophets, the Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles are not ſufficient, and that it is lawful to add unwritten Traditions thereunto. And let it not ſeem ſtrange, that the books of *Moſes* alone were then ſufficient unto ſalvation: for whoſoever will examine the books of *Joſhua*, of the *Judges* and of the *Prophets*, who did ſet forth their writings afterwards, ſhall find that they add nothing to the Doctrine of ſalvation, which is contained in the books of *Moſes*: only they add ſome confirmatory examples of the promiſes and menaces of God, ſome hiſtories of the chaſtiſements, judgments and deliverances of the Church, ſome Prophecies and future events, ſome particular expoſitions of that which the law of *Moſes* ſpoke in general, and ſome Commandments made to

ſome

ſome particular one, which were not general Laws nor perpetual in the Church. As for the Oracles which God gave amongſt the Cherubins, they were not Doctrines nor Canons of Religion, but anſwers upon future ſucceſſes, or upon the eſtate of the preſent affairs of peace or war. It is true that Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles have ſince given a more ample inſtruction: But I ſay that whilſt the Church had no other divine books, but thoſe of *Moſes*, they were ſufficient to ſalvation: For the Church ought to be contented with that meaſure of knowledge which God hath revealed. But in ſucceeding ages, if God revealeth ſomething more then he had done before, and preſenteth himſelf more obviouſly to human underſtandings; this falleth out neceſſary for thoſe, unto whom God's pleaſure is to have himſelf manifeſted.

That *Moſes* hath not diſtributed unwritten Traditions to the people, ſee his own teſtimony at *Deut.* 31. 24. in theſe words, *And it came to paſs, when* Moſes *had made an end of writing the words of the Law in a book, until they were finiſhed, that he commanded the Levites, which bare the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, ſaying, Take this book of the Law, and put it in the ſide of the Ark, &c.*

6. After the death of *Moſes*, God gave to *Joſhua* no other precept or document than this very book, as he himſelf ſpeaketh to *Joſhua* in the firſt Chapter: *Be ſtrong and courageous that thou mayeſt obſerve to do according to all the Law, which* Moſes *my ſervant commanded thee; turn not from it to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayeſt proſper whitherſoever thou goeſt. This book of the Law ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou ſhalt meditate therein day and night.* Surely God in this Law of *Moſes*, commandeth to obey the Sovereign ſacrificing Prieſt, as alſo the *Levites*, and the *Judges*, not when they ſhould add to the Law of God, but when they ſhould teach this Law: As it is ſaid at the 17. of *Deut.* 9. and 11. Where alſo the Kings are commanded to have the book of the Law of God always before their eyes, and to read therein all the days of their life, *verſe* the 18. and the 19.

7. None of our Adversaries durst yet deny, that the doctrine of the Gospel is sufficient to salvation, or gainsay that the Gospel is found whole and entire in the new Testament. Otherwise the title were false, and we should be forced to change the inscription, and set it down *part of the Gospel*, until the *Pope* doth publish the second part; or else be compelled to seek the other part of the Gospel in the unwritten word, which is not to be found. For our Adversaries would never suffer it to be compiled and reduced into one body, nor do they divulge any book which is called *the word of God*, except the Holy Scripture.

Some answer, ‡ that the books of the Gospel, which are in the new Testament, do contain all the Gospel but implicitly, that is to say, after an involved and imbroiled manner, the force of conscience hath extorted those words from them, for if the service of Images, adoration of Reliques, Pardons of one hundred thousand years, single life of Priests, succession of the *Pope* in the Apostleship of St. *Peter*, restraint of reading the Scripture, &c. are contained in the books of the new Testament, they must be lurking after an inveloped and obscure manner, for no man could ever descry them to be therein. Those that extract oyls and salts, out of the stones, would idly imploy their knowledge therein. For to speak in general, without any specification, that the Scripture approveth Traditions, is but a mockery, under this veil or shadow, there is neither tyranny, nor idolatry, nor bartering traffique, but many abound, and be practised in the Church, presupposing without proof, that these are the Traditions which the Scripture meaneth, for the *Pope* so judgeth of them, who cannot err in the Faith, though all these Traditions tend only to his profit.

8. I affirm the same of the title of the whole Bible, being called *the testament* or *Covenant of God*, which

‡ Jehan Jaubert. p. 308.

Title

Title muſt be changed, if the Scripture be but a part of God's Teſtament. It were deluding of the World to call *contract of marriage* a parchment that containeth but the moiety of the clauſes of the contract: Or to call *Teſtament*, that which is but a part of the diſpoſal of the laſt Will.

9. Towards the concluſion of the *Apocalypſe*, the Lord Jeſus ſpeaks as followeth: *I teſtify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book; If any man ſhall add unto theſe things, God ſhall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.* Upon which paſſage *the Council of Friuly* ſpeaketh thus: ‖ *In the Apocalypſe*, John *the Apoſtle under the name of one book, hath proteſted concerning the whole ſeries or proſecution of both Teſtaments, ſaying; If any man add to theſe things, God ſhall add to him the plagues that are written in this book.*

10. The Apoſtle St. *John* at the 20. Chapter of his Goſpel, 31. ſaith, *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, and that believing, ye might have life through his Name.* Upon which paſſage, *Cyrill* of *Alexandria* ſpeaketh in this manner. ‘§ All things which our Lord hath done are ‘not written, but thoſe things only, which they that ‘did write them, have believed to be ſufficient, to ‘the end, that ſhining in true faith, works, and vir‘tue, we may attain to the Kingdom of heaven.

11. Our Lord Jeſus at the 15. of *Matt.* 3. ſpoke to the Phariſees, *Why do ye tranſgreſs the commandment of God by your Tradition?* Obſerve here that he ſaith not *ye contradict*, but *ye tranſgreſs the commandment of*

‖ *Concilium Forojulienſe.* Nam in Apocalypſi Johannes Apoſtolus ſub unius libri appellatione de tota utriuſq; Teſtamenti ſerie conteſtatus eſt, dicens, Si quis appoſuerit ad hæc, apponet Deus omnes plagas ſcriptas libro hoc.

§ Cyrill. lib. 12. in Johan. cap. ultimo. Non igitur omnia quæ fecit Dominus conſcripta ſunt. ſed quæ ſcribentes tam ad mores quam ad dogmata putaverunt ſufficere, ut recta fide & operibus ac virtute rutilantes, ad regnum cœlorum perveniamus.

God by your Tradition. For indeed the *Phariſaical* Traditions were for the moſt part ſimple additions to the Law of God, having appearance of devotion, and things no otherwiſe forbidden, but as God forbiddeth to add to his word: As to faſt twice in a week, to lengthen out their fringes and Phylacteries of their garments, to waſh themſelves at return from market, ſcrupulouſly to clean the pots, and to accompt their paces upon the Sabbath.

12. The Apoſtle to the *Coloſſ* chap. 2. 8. *Beware leſt any man ſpoil you through Philoſophy and vain deceit, after the Tradition of men.* And that our adverſaries may not come here to diſtinguiſh human Traditions, from thoſe which the Church of *Rome* will have to be imbraced for divine and Apoſtolical, the Apoſtle ſpecifieth, and chiefly condemneth certain Traditions, found to be amongſt thoſe that are taught by the Church of *Rome:* to wit, ſervice of Angels, obſervation of Feaſts, and the ordinance of thoſe, who uſing a diſtinction of meats did ſay, *eat not, touch not, taſte not.* And this not becauſe they thought the meats to be hurtful or polluted in their nature, but (as the Apoſtle ſaith) *teaching theſe doctrines through voluntary devotion, and humbleneſs of ſpirit, in that they no way ſpare the body, nor have they reſpect to the fulneſs of the fleſh.*

13. The ſame Apoſtle to the *Epheſians* 2. chap. 20. groundeth our faith upon the Prophets and the Apoſtles. *Being built* (ſaith he) *upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles.* If our faith be grounded upon the unwritten word, it is behoveful there be another foundation than the Prophets and Apoſtles. For if our Adverſaries ſay that St. *Paul* underſtandeth the Church to be grounded upon the word of the Apoſtles as well written as unwritten, they oblige themſelves to ſay the ſame of the doctrine of the Prophets, and alſo to forge unto us Prophetical Traditions unwritten, which were never mentioned or ſpoken of about St. *Paul*'s time, moreover we have formerly heard our Adverſaries maintaining, that there are more things eſ-

ſential in Religion, than the Apoſtles have taught by mouth or writing.

14. At the 16. chapter of St. *Luke* 26. the wicked rich man being in hell, requeſteth *Abraham*, that one amongſt the dead ſhould be ſent to his brethren, to give them advertiſement, and warn them of their duties, leſt that they ſhould tumble into the like torment; to whom *Abraham* maketh anſwer, *They have* Moſes *and the Prophets, let them hearken to them.* Which is clearly to ſay, that they ought to content themſelves with the Doctrine of *Moſes* and the Prophets, which was read in the Synagogues every Sabbath, without expecting other revelation. For Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaketh of the unhappy rich man, as of a man that had lived under the old Teſtament, during the time that the Church had no other Doctrine, but that of the books of *Moſes* and the Prophets.

Chryſoſtom doth ſo underſtand it in his Commentary upon *Galat.* 1. Abraham *being required to ſend* Lazarus, *anſwereth, they have* Moſes *and the Prophets, if they hearken not to them, neither will they believe the dead raiſed up to life. Now Jeſus Chriſt bringeth in* Abraham *ſpeaking thus, to declare that he would have more faith aſcribed to the Scriptures, than if the dead were called back to life.*

15. At *Gal.* 1. 8. *Though we or an Angel from heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed* The vulgar Tranſlation of our Adverſaries interpreteth this paſſage as we do: *Licet nos aut Angelus de cælo evangelizet vobis, præterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis, anathema ſit.* Conſider now that this tranſlation which the Council of *Trent* declareth to be only authentical,

---

* ὁ μὲν ὢν Ἀβραὰμ ἀξιώμενος πέμψαι τὸν Λάζαρον ἔλεγεν, ἔχουσι Μωσέα καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, ἐὰν μὴ ἐκείνων ἀκούσωσιν οὐδὲ νεκρῶν ἀνιστάμενον ἀκούσωσι. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἀναγκαίως λέγοντα ὁ Χριστὸς, δείκνυσιν ὅτι καὶ νεκρῶν ἐγειρομένων μᾶλλον πιστέας εἶναι βούλεται τὰς γραφάς.

rendreth it *præterquam* not *contra*, that is to ſay, *other than*, but not *contrary*. For though this word *præter* ſometimes ſignifieth *contra*, yet *præterquam* cannot be ſo taken; and *præterquam quod* can import nothing elſe, but *other than that*. So though the Propoſition παρὰ uſed by the Apoſtle, ſignifieth ſometimes *contra*, yet our Adverſaries tranſlation admitteth not this expoſition *Chryſoſtom* in his Commentary upon *Gal.* 1. underſtandeth it the ſame way, ſaying, † *The Apoſtle ſaith not, if they declare things contrary, or if they pervert all, but if they preach never ſo little other than we have preached, or if they have altered any thing, be it never ſo little.* And *Theophilact* after him: ‡ *The Apoſtle hath not ſaid, if they preach only things contrary, but if they preach other than that which we have preached, that is to ſay, if they add never ſo little more thereunto.*

Tertullian in his book of Preſcriptions at the eighth Chapter, ſpeaking of the Scripture: * *In the firſt place we believe, that we ought not to believe other than this.* And at Chap. 14. ‖ *To know no other than this, is to know all.* And at Chap. 29. ‡‡ *If an Angel from Heaven preach other than, &c.* And truly the reaſon is plain, for if our Adverſaries confeſs, that Saint *Paul* hath preached all that is neceſſary to Salvation, as well by mouth as by writing, it followeth that he not only forbiddeth here to teach contrary to that which he hath taught, but alſo that he forbiddeth to add thereunto.

---

† ἐκ εἴπεν, ἐὰν ἐναντία καταγγέλλωσιν ἢ ἀνατρέπωσι τὸ πᾶν ἀλλὰ καὶ μικρόν τι εὐαγγελίζωνται παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα, κἂν τὸ τυχὸν παρα κινήσωσι.

‡ Theoph. in Ep. ad Gal. Neq; enim ſi contraria ſolum prædicaverint intulit, ſed ſi Evangeliſaverint præter id quod ipſi evangeliſavimus, hoc eſt, ſi pluſculum quippiam ipſi adderint.

* Tertull. de præſcr. ca. 8. Hoc prius credimus, non eſſe quod ultra credere debeamus.

‖ Et cap. 14. Nihil ultra ſcire omnia ſcire eſt.

‡‡ Et cap. 29. Etſi Angelus de cœlo aliter evangeliſaverit ultra quam nos, anathema ſit.

It

It is objected, that *Paul* himſelf hath added to that which he did preach, when he wrote more Epiſtles after that to the *Galatians*; and that Saint *John* after him wrote the *Apocalypſe*, and are not therefore accurſed. The vanity of this objection anſwereth itſelf; for nothing can appear wherein Saint *Paul* in his laſt Epiſtles, or Saint *John* in the *Apocalypſe*, have added to the Doctrine of ſalvation, which Saint *Paul* had preached by mouth, and digeſted into writing; and which was already contained in the books of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts. written before this Epiſtle.

In ſum, what availeth it to diſpute, whether the Apoſtle condemneth thoſe that preach *other than*, or *contrary* to that which St. *Paul* had preached, ſeeing that whatſoever is other than the Doctrine of the Goſpel concerning our Salvation, is alſo contrary, in as much as God forbiddeth to add thereunto? It is an unneceſſary work to rehearſe the paſſages of the Fathers, who affirm that the Apoſtle condemneth thoſe, who taught contrary to that which he himſelf hath taught: no man denieth it; for whoſoever preacheth contrary to that which Saint *Paul* taught, preacheth alſo other than the Doctrine of the Apoſtle: and addeth contrary things thereunto; contradictions being alſo additions to the Scripture.

Our Adverſaries being repulſed from this refuge or ſtarting hole, find out another, and ſay that Saint *Paul* condemneth thoſe who taught *other than*, or *contrary* to that which he had taught concerning the Doctrine of the Goſpel: but Saint *Paul* himſelf hath not ſet down all in writing which he hath taught: this is that which they ſay without proof or reaſon. For who told them that Saint *Paul* was tender, and forbore to book down all the Doctrine of the Goſpel in writing? Did he it in ſpleen, or was it of forgetfulneſs, or fearing leſt the people might become too expert in the Doctrine of the Goſpel? Surely they that ſpeak thus, are bound to open unto us ſome particular points, that make a part of the doctrine of the Goſpel, which Saint *Paul* would not ſet down in writing. Is it invocation of Saints, or Papal Indulgences, adoration of reliques, ſucceſſion of

the Pope in the Apoſtleſhip of Saint *Peter*, religious ſervice of Images, ſingle life of Prieſts, prayer in a tongue which the ſupplicant underſtandeth not, or Maſſes to free ſouls out of Purgatory? no Chriſtian will believe it of theſe, unleſs it be ſuch a one as hath a mind to be deceived: And this inconſiderate preſuppoſition muſt be countenanced by ſome other proof, beſides the teſtimony of our adverſaries.

Saint *Auguſtin* gave no credit to it: for he expoundeth this paſſage unto us by way of paraphraſe. * *If any man whether it concerneth Chriſt or his Church, or any other thing appertaining to faith, or government of life (I ſpeak not, if any of us; but that which* Paul *hath ſuggeſted, if an Angel from heaven) declare unto you, other then you have received in the Scriptures, concerning the Law and the Goſpel, let him be an Anathema.* And *Chryſoſtome* in his expoſition upon the 1. chap. to the *Galatians*, † Saint *Paul preferreth the Scriptures before Angels deſcending from heaven, and that moſt juſtly.* And a little after, *Wherefore he denounceth, that if any man preach unto you other than I have preached unto you*, &c.

To conclude, how ſhould thoſe points before recited have been preached by Saint *Paul*, conſidering that in his Epiſtles there is found a flat condemnation of their doctrines.

If beſide the holy Scripture there be ſome other word of God, it were fit our adverſaries ſhould lay them in view fairly above board, for the better avoidance of all ſtrife and controverſy ariſing from them. But they cannot. Only they would have the Church of *Rome* to be believed, and eſpecially the Pope; who

---

* *Auguſt lib.* 3. *contra lit. Petiliani cap.* 6. Si quis ſive de Chriſto, ſive de Ejus Eccleſia, ſive de quacunq; alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamq; noſtram, non dicam ſi nos, ſed quod Paulus adjecerit, ſi Angelus de Cœlo vobis enuntiaverit præterquam quod in ſcripturis legalibus et Evangelicis accepiſtis, anathema ſit.

† ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ ἀγγέλων ἐξ ὑψηλοῦ καταβαινόντων αὐτὰς προτιθῆσι καὶ γραφάς.

in

is circumſpect enough not to pronounce his own condemnation, nor to aboliſh the Traditions that are ſo beneficial unto him. Yea our adverſaries themſelves refute this, when they ſay that the Apoſtles have not taught by mouth, nor compoſed in writing all that is eſſential to Chriſtian Religion.

CHAP. XXII. *Whether to ground a Doctrine, it be lawful to uſe words equivalent to thoſe that are found in the Scripture, or to uſe conſequences and Arguments.*

SOME ſmattering and unquiet Jeſuits perceiving themſelves weak in the combat, by the preſſure of the evidence of truth, have thought upon a cavilling and impertinent courſe, whereby to entangle the diſputation at the very entrance, and to prevent ever coming to the true ſcanning or examination of the Doctrine.

Their cunning ſlight is always to queſtion and interrogate, inſtead of keeping themſelves to a regular and methodical argumentation; and as ſoon as we open our mouths, they call to us, *Shew me that which you ſay, word by word in the Scripture.* Now if there want but a ſyllable, or if it happen that we uſe theſe words, *that is to ſay*, or *by conſequent*, they fall into laughter and ſay that a Coach drawn by Horſes is a conſequent, and ſo break off, alledging they have reduced us to conſequences. If we quote ſome paſſage of Saint *Matthew* or of *Eſaiah*, they aſk whether the book be Canonical: If we anſwer, yea; they require a paſſage of the Scripture that ſaith, Saint *Matthew* is Canonical. If we expound one paſſage by another, they ſay, ſhew me a paſſage that alloweth this paſſage to be expounded by that. If we make an argument (though it be demonſtrative) they deride and jeer it, ſaying, that ſyllogiſms are but human diſcourſe, and an invention of *Ariſtotle*, unfit to regulate our faith.

But thoſe of our adverſaries who are better ſtored with knowledge, as *Thomas*, *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Perron*, *Salmeron* and *Vaſques* reject this wrangling Philo-

Philoſophy and froward reaſoning, which carpeth at Syllables, and is made for nothing elſe but to bring forth nothing, and brave and ſwagger in the ſpeed of running away.

Now, what an unjuſt caſe it is, that thoſe who attribute to the Church of *Rome* the power not only of adding to the Scripture, but alſo to alter that which God hath ordained in the Scripture, and who hold that their Church hath no obligation to the Scripture, ſhould uſe ſuch rigour againſt us, to bind us preciſely to the words and ſyllables of the Scripture: though we change nothing in the ſubſtance.

It were an eaſy matter for us to proceed againſt them after the ſame wiſe: replying to the firſt word they offer us, *Shew me what you ſay in as many words in the word of God written or unwritten*, for they take both for the rule of their inſtruction. And if they make uſe of theſe words *therefore* and *then*, to tell them, theſe are your reaſons and conſequences; and inſtead of giving a ſatisfactory anſwer, to enjoyn them that they prove unto us, that we are bound to prove to them what they demand: and ſo to break off with laughter and inſultation, this were the way (as the proverb hath it,) to counterfeit the fools with mad-Men.

If in handling points of the Faith, it be not permitted to make uſe of other words beſides thoſe that are found in the Scripture, it ſhall not be ſuffered to preach, nor to write commentaries, nor to confer the paſſages of the Scripture together: for this collation cannot be made without employing ſome other words, which form the compariſon, and ſhew the reſemblance. It ſhall not likewiſe be ſuffered to recite the Creed, nor to ſay there are but four *Evangeliſts* in the New Teſtament: for the Scripture ſpeaketh not this in ſo many words.

Moreover by this pedantical cavilation, neither *Charles* nor *Anthony*, nor any particular man ſhall be obliged to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, nor to obey him: For the Scripture neither ſpeaketh of *Charles* nor *Anthony*.

thony. But the duty of particular men is drawn by neceſſary conſequence, from the general rules that are in the Scripture.

So our adverſaries believe that *Pope Urban* is lawful ſucceſſor in the ſupremacy of Saint *Peter*, which nevertheleſs they derive by conſequence of this general Maxim, *that the Biſhops of* Rome *are lawful Succeſſors in the Primacy of* S. *Peter*. If from an imaginary Tradition they draw conſequences, why ſhould not we draw them from the holy Scripture?

When I ſay that *Purgatory*, and the Primacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* are Traditions, whereof the Scripture maketh no mention, how ſhould I ſhew this in ſo many Syllables, ſeeing I hold that it is not found therein at all? for if there were found a paſſage that ſaith, there is no ſuch thing as *Purgatory*, the Scripture ſhould make mention of *Purgatory*. Theſe men require the ſame, as when I ſhould ſay, that nothing is ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt in *Virgil's Æneids*, ſome trifling Sophiſter urgeth me to ſhew in the *Æneids*, a paſſage affirming that Jeſus Chriſt is not therein mentioned.

This peeviſh wrangling, no leſs injurious than troubleſome, taketh from the Chriſtians, all means of proving to a *Jew*, by the Prophets, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, for the name of Jeſus Chriſt is not found in the Prophets; yet certain it is, that the thing itſelf is therein explained in equivalent terms.

To be ſhort, in ſuch juggling Theology, it is impoſſible to prove by Scripture, that an *Ape* or *Cat* is not to be adored, for this is not found *totidem verbis* in the Scripture; but it is drawn from neceſſary conſequence of paſſages, wherein God alone will be worſhipped.

If I ſay that the ſoul is immortal, and that God governeth the World by his Providence; will theſe venerable Doctors take me by the throat, to ſhew them this ſillabically in ſo many words? Indeed it is not found in the ſame words, but in ſome other equivalent ſpeaking of the life eternal, in this manner: *God maketh all things according to the counſel of his will*, Epheſ. 1. 5. *And a Sparrow falleth not to the ground*

ground without the will of God, Matt. 9. 29. And God himſelf pronounceth, *My counſel ſhall ſtand, and I will accompliſh all my pleaſure*, Eſaiah 46. 10.

If the Scripture ſaith that God deſcendeth or runneth, or is inflamed with choler, or ſleepeth, ſhall it not be lawful to uſe plain and intelligible words in expounding theſe figures?

Likewiſe I find not in the Scripture the word *Trinity*, but I have found the word three; Saint *John* telling us that *there are three in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Spirit*, 1 John 5. 7.

I find not in the Scripture, *totidem verbis*, that the ſoul of the thief was not in *Limbo*. But I find that Jeſus Chriſt aſſured him, *Thou ſhalt this day be with me in Paradiſe*.

I find not in the Scripture in the ſame terms, that the Saints know not our hearts, but I find there how *God alone knoweth the hearts of men* 2. Chron. 6. 30.

There is no mention made of ſingle life of Prelates, in the ſame words, but there it is ſaid, *Let a Biſhop be huſband but of one wife*, 1 Tim. 3. 2.

Furthermore Jeſus Chriſt diſputing with the devil, Matt. 4. 11. told him, *It is written thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*. Which is a paſſage of the 6th of *Deut.* 13. *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, and ſhalt ſerve him, and ſwear by his Name*. To which paſſage, the Lord joineth another the 1. of *Sam.* chap. 7. 3. *Subject your hearts to the eternal God, and ſerve him alone*. Jeſus Chriſt made no ſcruple or difficulty to ſpeak the ſame thing in ſundry phraſes.

At the 18 *Acts* 28. it is related that *Apollos* a *Jew*, demonſtrated by the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, though it be not therein expreſſed in ſo many words.

And Saint *Peter* at the 10 *Acts* 43. ſpeaketh thus. *To Jeſus Chriſt give all the Prophets witneſs, that through his name, whoſoever believe in him, ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins*. Yet this is not found among the Prophets in expreſs words, but in equivalent terms, and

and by necessary consequence, shall we then be rebuked, if we alledge the Scripture after the same wont and form as Jesus Christ and the Apostles have done?

The Apostle Saint *Paul* in the 2d. to *Tim.* 1. 13. commanding us *to hold fast the form of sound words*, doth not bind us to syllables, for soundness and purity of doctrine, may copiously and in full sense dwell under the signification of several sorts of words, as health of body, may be cloathed under another habit. It is so taught by *Hierom* upon the 1 chap. to the *Galat.* * *Let us not think that the Gospel consisteth in the bare words of the Scripture, but in the true meaning and signification; not in the superficies, but in the very marrow, not in the leaves decked with words, but in the root of solid reason.*

The Fathers and ancient Councils were ignorant in such kind of importunate and unmannerly divinity, when they defined by the Scripture in the first *Nicene* Council, that the Son is † *consubstantial* with the Father. And when the first Council of *Ephesus* decreed against *Nestorius*, that the Virgin Mary might and ought to be called the ‡ *mother of God.*

The *Arians* pressed *Athanasius* to shew them this word *consubstantial* in the Scripture; to whom *Athanasius* answereth in his book of the decrees of the *Nicene* Council, '§ Though the very words be not so 'couched in the Scripture, yet they have the sense and 'understanding of the Scripture.'

---

* Ne putemus in verbis scripturarum esse Evangelium, sed in sensu, non in superficie, sed in medulla, non in sermonum foliis, sed in radice rationis.

† ὁμοούσιον.

‡ θεοτόκον. *Deipara.*

§ Εἰ κὰν μὴ ὕτως ἐν ταις γραφαῖς εἰσιν αἱ λέξεις, τὴν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διάνοιαν ἔχουσι. Ενδυμα τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐστιν αὐλοῖς ἡ φιλία τῦ γράμματος.

Gregory

Gregory of *Nazianzen*, at the end of his Sermon touching *Cyprian*, calls the *verbaliſts* θηρευτὰς συλλαβῶν καὶ λέξεων, hunters after Syllables and words. And in his 37th Oration, which is the fifth concerning *Theology*. he ſaith that 'the love of the letter is to them 'a ſhadow or cloak for impiety.

Ambroſe in his book concerning the Faith, written againſt the *Arians*, chap. 5. '* How do you ſay that 'conſubſtantial is not in the divine Scriptures? as if 'conſubſtantial were any thing elſe but, I am iſſue of 'the Father, and the Father and I are one.'

We learn out of *Photius*, his *Bibliotheca*, that *Theodoret* compoſed an expreſs treaty upon this ſubject, the inſcription whereof is, '† Againſt thoſe who af-'firm that we ought to rely on the words, without 'having regard to the matter ſignified.'

Touching this point, we have the moſt learned of our adverſaries on our ſide. *Bellarmin*, in his third Book of Juſtification, chap. 8. '‡ Nothing can be 'ſure in certainty of Faith, unleſs it be contained 'immediately in the word of God, or drawn from the 'word of God by ſome evident conſequence.'

Salmeron in his ninth *Prolegomenon*, '§ Not only the 'matter which is immediately contained in the Scrip-

---

* Quomodo dicis [in Scripturis homoouſion inveniri? quaſi aliud ſit homoouſion quam quod dicit, Ego de Patre exivi & ego et Pater unum ſumus

† πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι χρὴ δίχεσθαι τὰς φωνὰς καὶ μὴ σκοπεῖν τὰ διαὐτῶν σημαινόμενα.

‡ Non poteſt aliquid certum eſſe certitudine fidei, niſi aut immediate contineatur in verbo dei, aut ex verbo dei per evidentem conſequentiam deducatur, &c. Neque de hoc principio vel Catholici vel hæretici dubitant.

§ *Salmer. proleg. 9. prima quinquagen. Can. 7.* Non tantum divinam authoritatem habent, & fide ea tenenda ſunt quæ in Scripturis expreſſe continentur, ſed etiam ea omnia quæ ex illis neceſſaria & evidenta conſequentia deducuntur, quæ doctrina a magno illo Theologo Gregorio ad nos derivata eſt. *Et Paulo poſt*, Dupliciter aliquid eſſe in Scriptura dicitur, aut quia eſt expreſſe in ea contentum, et in ſenſu literali, deinde omne quod virtute in ea contentum eſt, & neceſſaria conſequentia extractum. Atque his duobus modis agere licet in hæreticos.

'tures, hath divine authority, and ought to be al-
'lowed with Faith; but also all things that are drawn
'from thence by necessary and evident consequence,
'which doctrine hath been derived unto us from
'*Greg.* that great Divine. And a little after a
'thing is said to be in the Scripture too manner of
'ways; partly because it is there contained expressly,
'and in the literal sense; partly because it is con-
'tained vertually therein, and is drawn from thence
'by necessary consequence, now it is lawful to dispute
'with Hereticks both these ways.' He bringeth Purgatory, merits, and satisfactions for examples; words that himself confesseth not to be in the Scripture, but may be drawn from thence by consequence.

Jesuit *Vasquez*, '§ It importeth not whether the
'word be in Scripture or no, so as that which it
'signifieth be in the Scripture.' *Jansenius* Bishop of *Ghent*, affirmeth the same at the 107th Chapter of his Harmony.

Our confession is frivolously objected unto us, which saith in the fifth Article, that 'the Scripture is the rule
'of all verity, containing all that is necessary for the
'service of God and our Salvation, to the which it is
'not lawful to add, diminish, or alter.' For if these novice doctors afforded themselves the leisure to read the following lines, they should there find, that 'we
'avow the three Creeds, to wit, the Apostles, the *Ni-*
'*cene*, and the *Athanasian*.' Which notwithstanding are not found in the Scripture, in such and so many words. And in the Article following, we approve of that which hath been determined by the ancient Councils, touching three persons in one individual essence, yet the determinations of Councils are not found to be in the Scripture in the same terms.

Our confession confineth us no more to the Scripture, than the Council of *Trent* bindeth our adver-

---

§ *Vazq. in* 1. *Par. Thomæ Tomo* 2. *Disp.* 110 *cap.* 1. §. *Quarto.* Nihil refert hanc vocem non esse in Scriptura, si vox id significat quod Scriptura docet.

versaries

verſaries to the word written and unwritten. Yet they would not be interrupted thereupon, nor that we ſhould enjoin them, to ſhew every word ſpoken by them, to be in ſo many ſyllables in the written word, or in that which is not written.

Whereas they ſuffer us not to bring one paſſage of Scripture, for expoſition of another, unleſs we ſuddenly bring a third, that ſaith this paſſage expoundeth that. By ſuch proceeding they take away and extinguiſh all means of expounding Scripture by Scripture: wherein alſo they contradict the Elders and Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, who grant that Scripture ſhall be interpreted by Scripture, as we have mentioned in my former book of the Judge of Controverſies, Chap. 4. For the expoſition of theſe words, *This is my body*, we alledge the paſſage of the Apoſtle, ſaying, *This bread which we break, is it not the Communion in the body of Chriſt?* Likewiſe, *When you ſhall eat of this Bread, or drink of his Cup, you ſhall declare the death of the Lord.* Hereupon theſe youngſters require a paſſage which ſaith, that theſe two laſt paſſages are the expoſition of the firſt. We anſwer that it is not needful, for it is ſufficient that theſe three paſſages ſpeak of the ſame thing. For to underſtand the doctrine of the Euchariſt, it is behoveful to collect together all that the Scripture maketh thereof mention; ſeeing that paſſages ſo comparatively united, do manifeſt and interpret one the other.

Theſe new Diſputants in rejecting all ſyllogiſms, and all arguments, are obſtinate and unexcuſable. For by what reaſon can they baniſh the uſe of reaſon from divinity? It were fitter for them to addreſs themſelves to the Thomiſts and Scotiſts, who are full of School brambles, and do ſubject Saint *Paul* to the poſitions of *Ariſtotle*, and cloath Divinity with a philoſophical habit. Yet theſe very men who forbid us to diſpute, do make arguments (after their manner) to the which it is impoſſible to give anſwer, by the ſole words of the Scripture. For we are conſtrained to ſay, *I deny the major*, or *the minor*, which are words not ſo much as touched in the Scripture.

What

What man, but a ſenſeleſs, is ignorant, that when two Propoſitions are ſoldered together as they ſhould be, the concluſion or inference muſt neceſſarily follow?

And this is not an invention of *Ariſtotle*, but a work of God, and a natural impreſſion, for peaſants make good arguments, though ill accommodated.

If of two propoſitions in an argument, one be drawn from the Scripture, the other be known by the ſenſe, and allowed by the adverſary, the concluſion ſhall follow of neceſſity. As for example, I ſpeak according to Scripture, that *every man is a liar*. To this Propoſition I add another well known by the ſenſe, and confeſſed by the adverſary, *Philip is a man*, whereupon the concluſion that followeth, *therefore*, *Philip is a liar*, cannot be denied, but by ſome witleſs ideot, and ſuch a one as will not ſtick to contradict himſelf, in denying that which neceſſarily followeth, upon the propoſition which he hath confeſſed.

As to the end it may not be thought, that this Concluſion hath no certainty, but by vertue of the two propoſitions, I ſay that without a formal ſyllogiſm, this concluſion *Philip is a liar* is contained in that propoſition *every man is a liar*, juſt as one crown is contained in ten, though there be no man to ſay it.

Thomas ought to have inſtructed them hereupon, who in the firſt part of his ſum, Queſt. 1. ſheweth, that ‘ * Theology is diſputative, and that by the arti‘cles of faith it proceedeth to ſhew ſome other thing, ‘as when the Apoſtle in 1 *Cor.* 15. diſputeth of the ‘Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, to prove the Reſurrec‘tion to be common.’ Upon which place *Vaſquez* in the twelfth Diſputation Chap. 2. maintaineth, that in the Theology if one propoſition be taken out of a paſſage of Scripture, and the other known by natural

* *Queſt.* 1. *art.* 8. Theologiam eſſe argumentariam, & ex articulis fidei procedere ad aliquid aliud oſtendendum. Sicut Apoſtolus 1. Cor. 15. a reſurrectione Chriſti argumentatur ad communem reſurrectionem probandam.

light,

light, a concluſion may be drawn from thence, which may ſerve for a definitive poſition in the faith.

It is true (ſay theſe men) that human reaſon may be deceived; and they ſay true. The ſame may be ſaid of the ſight and of he hearing, but would the dig out their own eyes, under colour that their eyes do ſometimes deceive them? Under the pretext that reaſon is ſometimes abuſed, ſhall they withhold us from the uſe of reaſon? Are there no good conſequences, and neceſſary? Becauſe ſome are evil, ſhall they reject thoſe that are good? If they will have it ſo, when the Doctors read to us ſome paſſage of Scripture, may not we tell them, 'Perhaps it is not there as you 'read it, you muſt not believe your eyes, for the ſight 'of a man may often be deluded and miſtaken?

Therefore the manner of making arguments, where reaſon is not deceived, and whence the concluſion cannot be denied, is that which I have ſaid, by joining to a propoſition drawn from the Scripture, a ſecond that is known by the ſenſe, or be a natural light, and is allowed by the Adverſary.

The way to put theſe Diſputants of our age to a *non plus*, is to ſtave them off from interrogations, and keep them to a ſollogiſtical method; for then they ſhall make an argument, wherein the ſecond propoſition ſhall be thus in ſubſtance; 'You are obliged by 'your own confeſſion to ſay nothing but what is in 'the Scripture,' *totidem verbis*, the which ought to be denied them.

It would be eaſy for us to touch our belief, in terms extracted word by word out of the Scripture, faſtning one paſſage to another without knot or connection. The language indeed would ill cohere, having neither the word *for* nor *then*, nor *wherefore*, nor all that ſerveth to diſpoſe its diſcourſe into parts, and to ſhew the proſecution of the reaſon. But in doing this, we ſhould cloſe up the mouths of theſe harebrained ſpirits, who take it in indignity, and are offended if a word *for*, be uſed which is not in the Scripture.

In one thing they ſpeak reaſonably. 'But if (ſay 'they) Ye be permitted to make uſe of conſequences,

'why

' why ſhall it not be lawful for us to do the ſame ?' This cannot be contradicted, but on condition that they obtrude not unto us *non ſequiturs* for conſequences, drawing all things out of all things, like ſo many Chymiſts. You may ſee ſome patterns of their conſequences: Chriſt hath ſaid, *I have to tell you many things, but you cannot for the preſent bear them away*: Therefore Chriſt hath taught that Saints ought to be invoked, images to be ſerved, and the Trinity to be painted. Chriſt hath ſaid, *do this*; therefore the Prieſt ſacrificeth the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Maſs. Chriſt hath ſaid, *tell it to the Church*, therefore the Church of *Rome* cannot err. Chriſt hath ſaid, *All that you ſhall looſe on earth ſhall be looſed in heaven*, therefore the Pope can let looſe under ground, and releaſe Souls out of Purgatory. *God hath made man after his own Image*; therefore images ought to be adored. Likewiſe, *Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is neither pardoned in this world nor in the world to come*; therefore there is a fire of Purgatory, to purge the ſouls. Conſequences that would provoke laughter, were it not that thereby the word of God is trodden under foot, and the ſervice of our Lord utterly depraved.

CHAP. XXIII. *Teſtimonies of the Fathers, touching the perfection of the Scripture.*

AS the authority of the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, is not ſupported by the authority of men, ſo alſo its perfection hath no want of their teſtimony. Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke at the fifth of *John* 34. *I ſeek not Teſtimony from Men.* To believe that the word of God is perfect, becauſe men affirm it, is to kindle a lamp to light the noon day; for God is not to be therefore truſted, becauſe men ſay the word it muſt be ſo. The word of God is as forcible alone, as in company, yea being alone it better guardeth its own authority. How groſs then and abſurd our adverſaries ſhould ſhew themſelves, in attempting to prove the inſufficiency of the Scripture, out

out of the Fathers, ſeeing that to defend her ſufficiency by warrant of the Fathers, is to derogate from her authority.

But before we liſten to the ancient Doctors in this queſtion, give us leave to proteſt, that we alledge them not to defend the Scripture, but by way of their juſtification: For they are made the advocates of error, contrary to their own intention. They are alledged to prove the inſufficiency of the Scripture, whoſe actual perfection and abſolute ſufficiency they exalt above all occurrences and tracts concerning the doctrine of ſalvation.

Clemens Alexandrinus in the ſixth book of his Stromata, '* We ſay nothing without the Scriptures.'

Tertullian in his book againſt *Hermogenes* wrote before he came a Montaniſt Heretick, in his 22. chap. '† The ſhop of *Hermogenes* declareth to us that it is 'written, but in caſe it be not written, let that *woe*, 'denounced againſt thoſe which add or diminiſh, be a 'terror unto them.' But when he afterwards ſlid away into Hereſy, he betook himſelf to maintain his doctrine by unwritten Traditions. For in his book of Monogamy, which he compiled being an Heretick, at the 2. chap. he tranſmitteth us to Tradition, alledging theſe words of our Lord: *I have many things to tell you, but you cannot carry them away at this time*; which is the paſſage that our adverſaries ordinarily produce for their Traditions.

St. *Hippolitus*, '‡ There is but one God, whom we 'know not by other means, but by the ſacred Scrip-

---

* οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν.

† Scriptum eſſe doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non eſt ſcriptum, timeat væ illud, adjicientibus aut detrahentibus deſtinatum.

‡ Hippol. tomo 3. Biblioth Patrum, pag. 20. & 21. Edit. Col. Unus Deus eſt, quem non aliunde agnoſcimus quam ex S. Scripturis. Quémadmodum niſi quis vellet ſapientiam hujus ſæculi exercere, non aliter hoc conſequi poterit, niſi dogmata Philoſophorum legat ſic quicunque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere, non aliunde diſcemus quam in Scripturis divinis.

'tures.

'tures. Even as he that would exerciſe the wiſdom of 'this age, cannot ſeek and obtain it, but by reading 'the opinions and precepts of Philoſophers: So all of 'us that would practiſe true piety towards God, can 'learn and comprehend it no way elſe, but by the holy 'Scriptures.'

St. *Athanaſius* in the beginning of his oration againſt the Gentiles. '§ The holy and divinely inſpir-'ed Scriptures, are ſufficient to cauſe the truth to be 'underſtood.' And in his book of our Saviour's Incarnation, 'Are you ſo inordinately deſperate as to re-'late things that are not written, and to keep your un-'derſtanding at ſuch diſtance from true piety?'

Ambroſe in his firſt book *de Officiis* chap. 23. '‖ How can we alledge things, not found to be in holy 'Scriptures?'

St. *Hilary* in his ſecond book againſt *Conſtantius*, '† I do admire thee, O Emperor *Conſtantius*, ſhewing 'thy deſire, that men ſhould believe, according as it is 'written.'

Baſil is excellent hereupon towards the end of his Ethicks, which are among his Aſcheticks: '* If '(ſaith he) all that is not of Faith be ſin, as the A-'poſtle ſpeaketh, and faith cometh by hearing, and 'hearing from the word of God, all that is without 'or beſide the holy Scripture divinely inſpired (not be-'ing of faith) is ſin.' And again in his Treatiſe con-

---

§ Athan. αὐτάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν αἱ ἁγίαι καὶ θεόπνευσται γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.

‖ *Ambroſ.* Quæ in ſcripturis ſanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum uſurpare poſſemus?

† *Hillar.* Te admiror, fidem tantum ſecundum ea quæ ſcripta ſunt deſiderantem.

* Baſil. εἰ γὰρ πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν, (ὡς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος) ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δ' ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὂν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.

cerning

cerning Faith: '* It is a manifest revolt from the faith, 'and a capital crime of pride and presumption to re-'ject any thing that is written, or to bring in any 'thing unwritten.' See also the same Father amongst his more compendious rules in the 95. definition.

St. *Cyrill* of Jerusalem is no less express. This good man in his fourth Catechism instructeth the people in this manner: '§ Touching the divine and sacred 'mysteries of the faith, the least matter is not to be 'taught without the holy Scriptures, nor suffered to 'be brought in after any sort whatsoever, either through 'probability, or through words fitly disposed. Yea, 'put no confidence in me that speak unto you these 'things, unless I give you proof, of that which I 'preach unto you, out of the holy Scriptures, for the 'integrity of our faith consisteth not in designs or con-'ferences artificially invented, but in proof drawn from 'the divine Scriptures.

And *Cyril* of Alexandria in the 2. book upon *Genesis*, '‡ How can we admit of that which the holy 'Scripture hath not said, or range it amongst absolute 'verities?' And in his seventh book against *Julian*, 'The holy Scripture is sufficient to make those wise, 'most approved, and of able understanding, who are 'therewith educated and instructed.'

Theodoret in his first Dialogue intituled *De Immutab.*

---

* Idem. φανερὰ ἔκπλωσις, πίστιως, καὶ ὑπερηφανιας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ εἰσαγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.

§ Cyril. Hier. Catech 4. c. de Spir. S. Δεῖ περι τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστιως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν, μηδὲ ἁπλῶς πιθανότητι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφερισθαι μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτα σοι λέγονλι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσης ἐὰν μὴ τὴν ἀποδειξιν τῶν καλαγγελλομένων ἀπο τῶν θείων μὴ λάβης γραφῶν.

‡ *Cyrillus Alexandr.* ὁ γαρ ἐκ εἴρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφὴ τίνα δὶ τρόπον παραδεξώμεθα, ἢ τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἴσχυσι καὶ λογιώμεθα.

' in

'† Bring not human reaſons to me, for I believe not 'in any thing, but the holy Scriptures.' And in his ſecond Dialogue, '§ I am not ſo raſh as to affirm any 'thing, wherein the ſacred Scripture is ſilent.'

Chryſoſtom, upon the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* the ſecond chapter, '‖ All things that are in the 'divine Scriptures are clear and ſincere, every thing 'that is neceſſary, is therein plain. And upon *Pſal.* 95. '* When any thing is ſpoken without the Scripture, 'the very cogitations of the hearers are lame.'

The ſame Father in his third Homily upon the ſecond to the *Corinthians*, calleth the Scripture an exact ballance, the rule and ſquare of all things. He ſaith not as *Bellarmine* (falſifying this paſſage) doth make him, that the Scripture is the moſt exact rule of all; but '‖‖ that it is the ballance, ſquare, and rule of all 'things.

Saint *Hierom*, upon the firſt Chapter, of the Prophet *Haggai*, '†† The things which they invent and 'forge of themſelves, as by the Apoſtolical Tradi-'tion, without the authority and teſtimony of the 'holy Scriptures, are ſtroken and daſhed by the very 'ſword of God.' And upon the Prophet *Micah*, *l.* 1. c. 1. 'The Church of Chriſt is not ſtrayed out 'of its limits, that is to ſay, from the holy Scriptures.'

---

† *Theod. Dialog.* 1. Ἐγὼ γὰρ μόνῃ πείθομαι τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ.

§ Et Dial. 2. Οὐ γάρ ὕτως εἰμὶ θρατὸς ὥστι φάναι τι σισιγημένον παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ.

‖ *Chryſoſt.* Παντα σαφῆ καὶ ἐυθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς, παντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα.

* Ἐάν τι ἄγραφον λέγηται, ἡ διάνοιατῶν ἀκροατῶν σκάζει.

‖‖ Ἀκριβῆ ζυγὸν ἁπάντων καὶ γνώμονα καὶ κανόνα. Bellar. de verbo dei lib. 4. cap. 11.

†† *Hieron.* Sed & alia quæ abſque authoritate & teſtimonio ſcripturarum quaſi traditione Apoſtolica ſponte reperiunt, percutit gladius Dei. Eccleſia Chriſti, &c. non eſt egreſſa de finibus ſuis, id eſt de Scripturis ſanctis.

So as to bring any thing from without the Scripture in the Doctrine of Salvation, is to wander out of the bounds that God hath prefixed to the Church.

The ſame Father againſt *Helvidius*, ‘ ‡ As we deny ‘ not that which is written, ſo we reject that which is ‘ written. We believe that God is born of a Virgin, ‘ becauſe we read it; but we believe not that ſhe was ‘ joined in marriage after her Child birth, becauſe ‘ we read it not.’

We have the life of St. *Anthony* (which ſome attribute to *Athanaſius*) ſpeaking, τὰς γραφὰς ἱκανὰς εἶναι πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, ‘ that the Scriptures are ſufficient ‘ for our Inſtruction.’

Saint *Auguſtin*, in his forty-ninth Treatiſe upon St. *John*, ‡‡ ‘ The Evangeliſt teſtifieth that Jeſus Chriſt both ‘ did and ſaid many things that are not written; but ‘ we have choſen the things eſteemed neceſſary to Sal- ‘ vation, which have been written.’

In his ſecond book, *De merito peccatorum & remiſſ.* Chap. 36. § ‘ When a matter of greateſt obſcurity and ‘ darkneſs is diſputed, without the aſſiſtance of the ‘ divine Scriptures evident and moſt certain direction, ‘ human preſumption ought to ſuppreſs itſelf. The knowledge that ſome impute to Saints concerning our cogitations, the *Limbus* for the Fathers, and that for little Infants, are matters very obſcure, yet concerning theſe points have we no paſſage in the word of God.

In the 142 Epiſtle, Chap. 9. ‘ * By the ſingle ‘ Scripture alone, you may fully know the will of ‘ God.’ And if it be ſuppoſed that this Epiſtle was

---

‡ *Hiero. in Helind.* Ut hæc quæ ſcripta ſunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non ſunt ſcripta renuimus. Natum Deum eſſe de virgine credimus quia legimus. Mariam nupſiſſe poſt partum non credimus quia non legimus.

‡‡ *Auguſt.* Evangeliſtâ teſtatur multa Dominum Chriſtum et dixiſſe et feciſſe quæ non ſcripta ſunt, electa ſunt autem quæ ſcriberentur, quæ ſaluti credentium ſufficere videbantur.

§ Ubi de re obſcuriſſima diſputatur, non adjuvantibus divinarum ſcripturarum certis clariſque documentis, cohibere ſe debet humana preſumptio.

* Per ſolas ſcripturas potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem.

not

not written by Saint *Auguſtin*, but by *Pelagius*, yet it is manifeſt, that *Auguſtin* never reprehended him for ſpeaking in this manner.

Alſo in his book of nature and grace, Chap. 61. A *Pelagian* reciting to him ſome Allegations of the Fathers, he anſwereth, ' † I owe my approbation and ' conſent only to the canonical Scriptures, without ' refuſal or excuſe.'

The ſame Doctor in his book of the unity of the Church, diſputeth againſt the *Donatiſts*, who affirmed that the true Church was on their ſide. *Auguſtin* to know which is the true Church, will have the queſtion determined by the Scriptures alone; not by the Hiſtories and human Teſtimonies, whereof the *Donatiſts* make their uſe and beſt advantage. Theſe are his words in the ſecond chapter, ‡ ' What ſhall we ' do then? Shall we ſeek the Church in our words, ' or in the words of her head, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt? ' I conceive that we ought rather to ſeek it in the ' words of him, who is the truth itſelf.' Diametrically oppoſing our adverſaries, who will have the Scripture notified and received by the Teſtimony of the Church: He on the other ſide will have us take notice, and embrace the true Church, by the Teſtimony of the Scripture. And in the third chapter purſuing this Diſcourſe: ‖ ' But as I began to ſay, let us not ' hear it ſpoken, I ſay this, thou ſayeſt that, but let ' us hear, this ſaith the Lord. There are aſſuredly ' books of the Lord, to whoſe authority we both ' ſubſcribe, therein we both believe, to them are we ' both ſubject, that is the place where we are to ſeek

† Solis Canonicis debeo ſine ulla recuſatione conſenſum.

‡ Quid ergo facturi ſumus? in verbis noſtris eam quæſituri, an in verbis capitis ſui, Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti? Puto quod in illius potius verbis eam quærere debemus qui veritas eſt.

‖ Sed ut dicere cæperam, non audiamus hæc dico, hæc dicis, ſed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus. Sunt certè libri dominici quorum authoritati utrique conſentimus, utrique credimus, utrique ſervimus. Ibi quæramus Eccleſiam, ibi diſcutiamus cauſam noſtram.

'the Church, there we debate our cause.' This pious Doctor spoke not as too many do in these days, that the Scripture is not Judge, that it is a dumb Rule, that it is ambiguous, that it containeth not all things necessary to salvation, that the faith of the Church regulates the Scripture, and not on the contrary; he would have the Question of the Church decided by the Scripture alone. Whereupon he addeth, '§ Let us despise and cast from us those allega-'tions, which we make one against another, and are 'not taken from the divine canonical books, but 'from elsewhere. For (urging further) I desire that 'the Church be proved, not by human documents or 'instructions, but by divine Oracles.' He calleth human instructions, all that is alledged without the Scripture. Can our Adversaries by this course ever prove, that the Church of *Rome* is only the true Church, rather than the *Græcian*, or the *Syrian*? and that the Pope is Saint *Peter*'s Successor, in the charge of head of the universal Church? At the last, after many passages of Scripture called to mind, and uttered in defence of it, turning his design towards the *Donatists*, he summoneth them to prove their positions by Scripture. 'Read us that in the Law, the Prophets, the 'Psalms, the Gospel itself, or writings of the Apostles 'and we shall believe.' Observe directly how we proceed with our adversaries; for we call upon them, '* Read us invocation of Saints, Images of the Trini-'ty, adoration of Reliques, or succession of the Pope 'in the Apostleship of Saint *Peter*, in the writings 'of the Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, and we will 'believe them.' But they are so nettled at this, that (following the Example of the *Donatists*) they censure this demand to be unjust, remanding us to Tradition,

§ Auferantur ergo illa de medio, quæ adversus nos invicem, non ex divinis Canonicis libris, sed aliunde recitamus.

* Cap. 6. Legite nobis hoc de Lege, de Prophetis, de Psalmis, de ipso Evangelio, Apostolicis literis, legite, & credemus.

which

which they call the unwritten word, taught by the mouth of the Church, that is to ſay, the Pope and a few Prelates, who domineer by means of theſe Traditions, which are all accommodated to their profit, and ſubdued to their power.

This holy perſonage cannot be ſatisfied with long enough inſiſting upon this ſubject, and if this book were not to be found in all Saint *Auguſtin*'s works, or that it were without a title, our Adverſaries would ſay, that *Calvin*, or *Beza* had contrived it to their humour. For he addeth, '* Let *Donat* read me 'that in the holy Scriptures, and he ſhall be no 'Anathema.' Likewiſe, '‡ Let them read us that in 'the holy Scriptures, and we will believe it.' And a little after, rejecting the proofs of the *Donatiſts*, who alledged miracles for themſelves, and the Councils of their Biſhops, and the belief of the people, ſaith, '§ Such like matters being laid aſide, let them 'demonſtrate and prove their Church if they be 'able, not in diſcourſes and rumours of *Africans*, 'not by the Councils of their Biſhops, nor by the 'writings of ſuch and ſuch Diſputants, nor by cheating ſigns and miracles; for againſt theſe devices we 'are armed and prepared with the word of God; but 'by the ordinances of the Law, by the predictions of 'the Prophets, by the Canticles of the *Pſalms*, by the 'words of the Shepherd himſelf, by the preachings 'and pains taking of the Evangeliſts, that is to ſay, by 'all the Canonical authorities of the holy Books.'

---

* Cap. 12. Legat mihi hoc in ſcripturis ſanctis, & non ſit Anathema.

‡ Cap. 15. Legant hoc nobis de ſcripturis ſanctis, & nos credemus.

§ Cap. 16. Remotis igitur talibus Eccleſiam ſuam demonſtrent ſi poſſunt, non in ſermonibus & rumoribus Afrorum, non in conciliis Epiſcoporum ſuorum, non literis quorumlibet diſputatorum, non in ſignis & prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra iſta verbo Domini præparati & cauti redditi ſumus, ſed in præſcripto Legis, in Prophetarum prædictis in Pſalmorum cantibus, in ipſius paſtoris vocibus, in Evangeliſtarum prædictionibus & laboribus, hoc eſt, in omnibus Canonicis ſanctorum librorum authoritatibus.

But as concerning another difficulty propoſed, to wit, that there was obſcurity in the Scripture, and that there was difference and diſagreement touching the ſenſe of the paſſages which were alledged, he doth not in manner of our adverſaries, who ſtrive to make the Church infallible interpreter: For in ſo doing, one of the parties ſhould be judge; and the Church ſhould not be ſubject to any judgment; but he averreth that leaving the obſcure paſſages, every one may make uſe of thoſe that are plain, preſuppoſing that what is ſaid obſcurely in one paſſage, is clearly manifeſted in others. Aſſuring withal, that there is no other way to avoid doubtfulneſs and difficulty. '* I propoſe this (ſaith 'he) to the end we may chuſe the paſſages, that are 'moſt clear and manifeſt; the which being not found 'in the holy Scriptures, there ſhould be no further 'means to open things that are ſhut up, and explain 'the obſcure'.

For (as he ſpeaketh in another place) '† In matters 'that are plainly ſet down in the holy Scriptures, are 'found all things that concern the faith and good 'manners', As *Baſil* hath it in his *Breviores Regulæ*, at the 267. Anſwer. 'The matter that ſeemeth to 'be obſcurely mentioned in ſome paſſages of the Scrip-'ture divinely inſpired, is interpreted by that which 'is more clearly ſet down in other places.'

He in his third book againſt *Maximine*, *Chap.* 14. diſputeth thus againſt an Heretick; ‖ 'Now I ought 'not alledge the Nicene Council, nor thou the Ari-

---

* Cap. 4. Hoc etiam prædico atq; propono, ut quæque aperta & manifeſta deligamus, quæ ſi in S. Scripturis non invenirentur, nullo modo eſſent unde aperirentur clauſa, & illuſtrarentur obſcura.

† Lib. 2. de doct. Chri. cap. 9. In his quæ apertè poſita ſunt in Scriptura inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi.

‖ Sed nunc nec ego Nicenum nec tu debes Ariminenſe tanquam præjudicaturus proferre Concilium: Nec ego hujus authoritate, nec tu illius detineris. Scripturarum authoritatibus non quorumque propriis, ſed utriq; communibus teſtibus, res cum re, cauſa cum cauſa, ratio cum ratione concertet.

'minenſian

'minenſian by way of prejudging. I am not bound 'to the authority of that, nor thou to the authority of 'this. Let one thing be oppoſed to another, one 'cauſe to another, and one reaſon to another reaſon, 'and this by authorities of the Scriptures, which are 'not particular to ſuch and ſuch, but are common wit-'neſſes to one and the other party.'

Origen in his Homily upon *Jeremiah*, '§ It is ne-'ceſſary that we bring the holy Scriptures to witneſs, 'for without them our opinions and reports are not 'worthy to be believed.' *Bellarmin* anſwereth, that *Origen* ſpeaketh only of obſcure queſtions, concerning which, he thinketh it behoveful, that they be taught by the Scripture. But beſides that, the whole proceeding of *Origen* in this paſſage, maketh the contrary to appear: The Cardinal deceiveth himſelf, if he think that the things eaſy to be underſtood (as that God hath created the world, and that Jeſus Chriſt is dead for us) have not as much need of the authority of the Scripture, as thoſe that are obſcure; but on the contrary, it is not neceſſary to penetrate into the knowledge of many obſcure things; and God hath not deemed it requiſite to ſatisfy curioſity therein. Moreover, *Bellarmin* ſpeaking in that manner, condemneth a great number of Traditions in the Romiſh Church, which are moſt obſcure; as the Tradition of *Limbus* for the Fathers, and that for little infants. The Tradition that the Saints know our thoughts, and behold all things in God's face. The Tradition that the Saints know our thoughts, and behold all things in God's face. The Tradition of accidents without ſubject in the Euchariſt. The Tradition that the Virgin *Mary* is crowned Queen of Heaven; which are things wherein man's underſtanding is benummed, all being full of uncertain preſumptions. And it were moſt needful to have the Scripture teſtifying for them, if it be ſo that in obſcure things we ought to be taught by the holy Scripture.

---

§ Neceſſe nobis eſt ſanctas Scripturas in teſtimonium vocare. Senſus quippe noſtri & enarrationes ſine his teſtibus non habent fidem. Bell. lib. de verbo Dei non ſcripto, cap. 11. ſect. 2.

I will add the opinion of the Emperor *Conſtantine* the great for a cloſe, who was the man in this world after the Apoſtles, that did moſt good to the Chriſtian Church. Of him *Theodoret* reporteth, that at the overture of the great Nicene Council, exhorting the 318. Biſhops aſſembled to determine controverſies, he ſpeaketh in this manner: '‡ The Evangelical and A-'poſtolick books, and the Oracles of the antient Pro-'phets inſtruct us plainly in our Belief, concerning di-'vine matters. Wherefore all unfriendly contention 'being thrown to the ground, let us draw the ſolving 'of doubts from the words divinely inſpired'. This holy diſcourſe diſpleaſeth *Bellarmin*, for he ſaith, '* That *Conſtantine* was a great Emperor, but no 'great Doctor of the Church, and that he underſtood 'not the ſecrets of religion. † And *Andradius* affirmeth, 'that theſe words of *Conſtantine* pleaſed none but the 'heretical Arians.' But who was he among the Antients that ever blamed this Emperor for ſpeaking ſo? Yea, do not all the Hiſtorians magnify his prudence and ſage management of affairs in this Council? And verily this Council hath followed his counſel, and refuted not the Arians by other ſtrength of Argument, than by the holy Scripture.

It is evident by this paſſage, that *Conſtantine* until then had allowed no other inſtruction but by the holy Scriptures, and that no man taught after the faſhion of the *Romiſh* Church at this time, wherein men begin with Tradition, in ſaying that the authority of the

---

‡ *Theod. lib.* 1. *Hiſtor. ca.* 7. Εναγγελικαὶ βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ, καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν τὰ θεοπίσματα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς ἃ χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θείου φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύουσι. τὸν πολεμοποιὸν οὖν ἀπελάσαντες ἔριν ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν.

* *Bell. lib. de verb. Dei non ſcripto cap.* 11. §. *tertio.* Erat Conſtantinus magnus Imperator, ſed non magnus Eccleſiæ Doctor.

† *Andrad. lib.* 2. *Defenſ. Fidei Trid. initio.* Non advertunt prudentes homines tantum Ariani qui Seleuciæ convenerunt, iſtam Conſtantini orationem arriſiſſe.

Scripture

Scripture is founded upon the Tradition of the Church.

If then in matters neceſſary to ſalvation, theſe Doctors for three or four ages after the Apoſtles did reject all Traditions not contained in the holy Scriptures, much more and with ſtronger reaſon it ſtandeth, that after ſo many ages tranſacted, there ſhould be leſs probability of cauſe to make new additions. For when ſhall there be any ceſſation of adding? *Bellarmin* in his 3. Chapter againſt *Barkley*, perceiving that the *Pope*'s power to depoſe Kings, is deſtitute of all Teſtimony of antiquity, ſaith, '† that he judgeth not 'ſoundly of the Church of Chriſt, who admitteth no-'thing but what he readeth expreſly to have been done 'or ſaid in the antient Church. As if the Church of 'the latter time had either diſcontinued and left off 'to be a Church, or had not the faculty of explicating 'or declaring, conſtituting, and ordaining matters 'which concern the faith, and manners of Chriſtians.' Whence it followeth, that the Church of *Rome* is not yet compleat and finiſhed in her perfection, ſeeing that precepts touching the faith, and rule of morality may be added thereunto; as indeed there are yet many that are hot in the forge, and freſhly hammered upon the anvil of avarice, and ambition. But this Cardinal ought to conſider, that ſeeing this Tradition touching the *Pope*'s power to depoſe Kings, maketh the *Pope* King of Kings; It is not juſt or reaſonable, that the *Pope* ſhould be judge thereof, nor that he ſhould be permitted without rendering account to any other perſon, to introduce ſuch Traditions without the word of God, whereby to inveigle the temporal wealth, and to make himſelf the monarch on earth.

† Non recte de Eccleſia ſentit qui nihil admittit niſi quod expreſſe in veteri Eccleſia ſcriptum aut factum eſſe legit. Quaſi Eccleſia poſterioris temporis aut deſierit eſſe Eccleſia, aut facultatem non habuerit explicandi & declarandi, conſtituendi etiam et jubendi quæ ad fidem et mores Chriſtianos pertinent.

By this very doctrine the *Jeſuit* equalleth in authority the *Romiſh* Church of this time, to the Church of the Apoſtles time. Yet it is the Church of the Apoſtles time, which regulateth the ſucceeding ages. And thoſe firſt Heralds of grace in Jeſus Chriſt, are yet ſeated upon the twelve thrones Judging the twelve Tribes of Iſrael.

From this ſource proceeded the Bull *Exurge*, which is at the end of the laſt *Lateran* Council, placing this amongſt the Hereſies of *Luther*, when he ſaid that 'It is not in the power of the Pope, and Church of 'Rome, to eſtabliſh Articles of faith.' ‖ Hence alſo proceeded the remonſtrance, which the Council of *Florence* publiſhed; that the Church of *Rome* had juſt power to add to the Creed.

CHAP. XXIV. *How the Texts and Paſſages of the Fathers, which our adverſaries alledge for the unwritten Traditions, ought to be underſtood.*

SEEING that in matter of Chriſtian faith, and the points neceſſary to ſalvation, the *Fathers* do unanimouſly cleave to the ſole word of God, contained in the Holy Scriptures, it were a ſtrange thing if after this, they ſhould ſeek to ground themſelves upon Traditions, and to ſurmiſe in matter of ſalvation, another word unwritten. Certainly the Doctors who ſhould deſtroy that which they have built up, ought not to be believed; by no means ſhould they be credited, who credit not themſelves.

Three ſorts of good Traditions.

Now for the better purging of them from this blame, it would be neceſſary to remember that which we have formerly ſpoken, to wit, 1. That we reject not all ſorts of Traditions; for the Scripture itſelf is a Tradition, which is one reaſon. 2. A ſecond is, becauſe there are Traditions which are not matters of Faith,

‖ *Syn. Flor. Seſſ. ult.* Romana Eccleſia neceſſitate urgente jure ſuo particulam illam *ex filioque* Symbolo apponere licuiſſe.

not

nor neceſſary to ſalvation, but cuſtoms, and reglements, touching Eccleſiaſtical policy: which we willingly approve, when we ſee that they have been received in the antient Church by a general conſent. And *Satan* having alienated any one of theſe cuſtoms, and turned it to Idolatry, or converted it to any other end unpractiſed before, we do not believe that in deſerting ſuch a cuſtom, Chriſtian Religion is a whit impaired; but it were wiſely done to bar up that gate againſt the devil. 3. A third is, becauſe there are alſo Doctrines taught in the Scripture, which are there not found in the ſame terms as the Antients propoſe them, but are therein found in equivalent words, or are deduced from thence by neceſſary conſequence. If any man will call theſe doctrines *Traditions* we will not quarrel with him thereupon, provided that he allow ſuch Traditions to be bottomed with the Scripture, and there to be found in ſubſtance.

I ſay then, as often as the Fathers mention and give way to Traditions, their meaning is of thoſe three ſorts afore recited: That is to ſay, either of the Scripture itſelf; or of cuſtoms and reglements of Eccleſiaſtical policy, and of matters not neceſſary to ſalvation; or of Occurrences contained in the Scripture, yet not there found in the ſame words, as the antients propoſe them, but in ſubſtance and by conſequence, to prove the which we have employed the Chapter following.

CHAP. XXV. *A proof of that which went before.*

SOME do object *Irenæus* unto us (who wrote about the end of the ſecond age) that in his 3 book 4 chap. diſputing againſt Hereticks that gave no admiſſion to the Scriptures, laboureth to convince them by *Traditions*, that is to ſay, (as he expoundeth himſelf) by the ſucceſſion of the doctrine left from hand to hand, in the Churches erected by the Apoſtles.

What?

What? (ſaith he) '§ If the Apoſtles had not left us the 'Scriptures, would it not have been needful to follow 'the order of Tradition, which they delivered to thoſe, 'unto whoſe truſt they committed the Churches?' And to good purpoſe he ſaid it: For if we had not the holy Scriptures, we ſhould have been conſtrained to have recourſe unto weaker means, and of leſs certainty. And it behoveth that when he ſpeaketh in that manner, it be to ſuch as are refractory and averſe from the Scriptures, but not to us who cordially embrace them, and ſet up our laſt reſt upon them. Moreover from the time of *Irenæus*, the ſucceſſion was but ſhort, and the memory of things taught by the mouth of the Apoſtles freſh, of the which the remembrance would be razed and put out, if we had not the writings of the Apoſtles. For the continuation of time, and the ſubverſion, corruption, and ſchiſm of ſo many Churches, which then unanimouſly concurred, and are now at variance, boaſting of their ſucceſſion, maketh this ſearch and examination impoſſible to the Chriſtian people, and full of uncertainty.

But at length what are theſe doctrines which *Irenæus* would have to be taught and learned by Tradition, if we had not the Scripture? Is it invocation of Saints, ſervice of Images, adoration of Relicks, the Communion under one kind, or the Romiſh Indulgences: no ſuch matter; it is the doctrine touching the Creation, and touching the nature and office of Jeſus Chriſt contained moſt clearly in the Scripture; which appeareth not only for that herein he ſkirmiſheth and contendeth againſt the Hereticks, erring in theſe points; but alſo in that he ſaith, that we ought to ſeek theſe things by Tradition, if we have not the Scriptures; acknowledging that theſe things are taught by the Scriptures. Aſſuredly *Irenæus* by Tradition, intendeth not to ſpeak of any addition to the Scripture, but he ſpeak-

§ Quid autem ſi neq; Apoſtoli Scripturas quidem reliquiſſent nobis nonne oporteret ordinem ſequi traditionis quam tradiderant ejus quibus committebant Eccleſias?

gth

eth of the ſucceſſion from hand to hand, whereby the doctrine of the Goſpel was trained on to his time: And in this very place ſpeaking of certain barbarous people, that had received the Goſpel by Tradition without Scripture, he interpreteth the articles of this Tradition, which are the articles of the Apoſtles Creed.

Alſo it is not amiſs to have the Reader advertiſed, that *Irenæus* in theſe ſame books, which he hath written againſt the Hereticks, treateth concerning Traditions not contained in the holy Scriptures, which the Church of *Rome* approveth not. He teacheth, that 'Souls ſeparated from the bodies have feet and 'hands, and a corporal figure.' He holdeth, that the 'Souls iſſuing out of the bodies mount not up to Ce-'leſtial glory, but into a terreſtrial Paradiſe.' And that 'Before the publication of the law, no law was given 'to the Fathers,' becauſe they were juſt: And the law was not ordained for the juſt, who had no need to be admoniſhed by written letters. But when juſtice was loſt in Ægypt, then God gave his Law unto the people.

The ſame Father teacheth, that the kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt ought to endure no longer than one thouſand years, which is an error of the Chiliaſts: and that they ſhall then feaſt themſelves with delicate Wines, and exquiſite Viands. So little certainty there is in men, as ſoon as they ſtart aſide from the ſacred Scripture. With what conſcience can our adverſaries alledge *Irenæus* in the behalf of Traditions, ſeeing his Air ſo diſtaſteful to them? ‡ He alſo condemneth *Invocation of Angels, and the haughtineſs of* Victor *Biſhop of* Rome,

---

* *Iren. lib.* 2. *cap.* 62. Pleniſſimè Dominus docuit, animas characterem corporis, in quo etiam adaptentur, cuſtodire eundem. *Et chap.* 63. Per hæc manifeſtiſſimè declaratum eſt et perſeverare animas et non de corpore in corpus tranſire, et habere hominis figuram. *Iren. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. & *lib.* 5. *cap.* 31. *Iren. lib.* 5. *cap.* 33. & 34. & 35.

‡ *Iren. lib.* 2. *cap.* 57. Eccleſia non invocationibus Angelicis faciens aliquid, ſed mundè, purè & manifeſtè orationes dirigens ad Dominum, &c.

as *Euſebius* recordeth it in the 5. book of his Hiſtory, chap. 25.

They ſerve alſo their turns upon the teſtimony of *Clemens Alex.* to back their Traditions. *Euſeb.* in the 6. Book of his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, chap. 11. * remembreth one paſſage of him, where he reporteth that his brothers importuned him, to teach them the Traditions which he had heard by the ancient Prieſts. But he maketh no mention whether theſe Traditions were matters not contained in the Scriptures. Now the Reader may here note, upon what ground work Papiſm is built: our adverſaries to ſhoulder it up, do ſcrape together the moſt excremental ſcum of the Fathers, like to the carrion Crows that forſake trees beautified with delicious fruit, to caſt themſelves down upon nauſeous carcaſſes. Obſerve this *Clement* full fraught with his idle and extravagant Traditions, fitting to his purpoſe, this paſſage of the 1. to the *Corinthians*: † *We declare Wiſdom among the perfect*, as our adverſaries do in like manner. ‡ Liſten then to his Traditions. He holdeth that *the Greeks, that is to ſay, the Pagans were juſtified and ſaved by Philoſophy.* That there are four perſons in God. That the Angels are fallen from their purity by their cohabitation with Women. ‖ That *the death of Jeſus Chriſt did not come to paſs by the will of God.* That *afflictions do not ſeize upon us through God's will and command, but that he no way hindreth it, and by his ſimple permiſſion. That God is a body.* That *the Apoſtle Saint* Paul *exhorted the Chriſtians* to read the

---

* Ας ἔτυχε παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων πρεσβυτέρων ἀκηκοὼς παραδόσεις.

† Strom. lib. 5.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 1. pag. 137. καί τοι κ᾽ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἱδικαίου ποτε κ᾽ ἡ φιλοσοφία τὸς Ελληνας.

‖ Plurima ejuſmodi habet lib. 1. Strom. pag. 121. & ſeq. edit. Comelianæ. et. li. 6. Idem lib. 2. Strom. pa. 173. τῆς τρίτης ἤδη μόνης συναπλώσης ἐπὶ τὴν τῦ κυρίυ τετάρτην ὑπόϛασιν. Strom. lib. 3. pag. 193. Strom. lib. 4. pag. 217. Strom. lib. 5. pag. 252. Strom. lib. 6. pag. 270.

Books

Books of the Grecians, of the Sybils, and of Hyſtaſpes. That Chriſt had foretold to the Jews which ſhould be converted, that their ſins ſhould be pardoned them within two years. That Chriſt hath preached to the Jews which were in hell, and that the Apoſtles alſo deſcended into hell to preach to the Gentiles, to work their converſion. And in the ſame fixth book of his Stromata, ſpeaking of a ſage or wiſe man in this preſent life, ſaith, he is not ſubject to any paſſion or alteration, and that he is without joy or fear, or confidence; * to be ſhort, he maketh him *a God in the ſhape of man*, and calleth ſuch a man *a Gnoſtick:* and will have him to be ſkilled in Muſick and in the Mathematicks, in Logick and Aſtronomy. He affirmeth that * *God hath given the Sun and Moon to the Pagans to worſhip them, to the end they might not be without a Religion.* And ſpeaketh of Gods in the plural, as if there were many of them. Are theſe the Traditions which our adverſaries obtrude upon us to prove the inſufficiency of the Scripture? or if theſe diſpleaſe them, why do they rely upon the authority of one that coineth Traditions, whereof the memory ſhould be buried for everlaſting?

At the ſame time *Tertullian* wrote his book *de Militis Corona.* In the 2. chap. of the ſame book, he filleth up a long liſt of unwritten Traditions, which are, that in Baptiſm the Chriſtians of his time renounced the Devil and his pomp, and his Angels: that they were plunged three times into the water: that they taſted the miſcellane or hotchpot of milk and honey: that they made conſcience of waſhing themſelves ſeven days after: that they participated of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in the aſſemblies made before day, and would not receive it from any hand but of thoſe that did preſide: that they made offerings (ſo they called the gifts which the people did preſent) for the defunct upon the day of the Nativity, one day every year. By the

---

* Strom. lib. 6. pag. 276. Διὸν ἀνδρωποειδῆ.
* Strom. lib. 6. pag. 284.

day

day of Nativity he underſtandeth that day, whereon the memory of Martyrs was yearly celebrated, as alſo whereon Offerings were made, and Alms given in memory of them.

Furthermore he addeth the Tradition wherein they account it a foul Sin to faſt upon the Lord's day, and to pray that day kneeling; and the cuſtom (when they trample and walk abroad) in putting on their ſhoes, to mark themſelves in the forehead with the ſign of the Croſs, ſumming all up with this ſaying; * 'If thou expoſtulate the legal condition of theſe diſciplines and 'others the like, thou ſhalt not find it. Tradition is 'pretended to thee which increaſeth them, cuſtom 'which confirmeth them, and faith which obſerveth 'them.'

Our Adverſaries do ſhrowd themſelves in the protection of this laſt paſſage, to eſtabliſh their Traditions. Yet can there not be a more proper paſſage alledged to confirm the ſame which I have ſaid concerning the Traditions which the Fathers have handled, that they are not Doctrines of faith, nor matters neceſſary to Salvation, but only Ceremonies and Cuſtoms, and Laws of Eccleſiaſtical policy, which the Church of *Rome* hath forſaken for the moſt part, and regardeth them no more. For all the Traditions of *Tertullian* are but Cuſtoms and Ceremonies; whereupon he calleth them *Diſciplines*, and there is nothing therein which concerneth the Doctrine of faith, or is neceſſary to Salvation. And concerning the queſtion which he diſcuſſeth in this book, whether a Chriſtian Soldier at a day of muſter, when all the Soldiers were crowned with a Lawrel, did better in chuſing rather to ſuffer martyrdom, than to put the crown upon his head, contenting himſelf to hold it in his hand; I ſay it is not a point of faith, but an opinion wherein *Tertullian* had but a few to ſecond him. For the other Chriſtians accuſed this ſoldier of

---

* Harum et cæterarum ejuſmodi diſciplinarum ſi legem expoſtules Scripturarum, nullam invenies. Traditio tibi prætenditur auctrix, conſuetudo confirmatrix, et fides obſervatrix.

temerity,

temerity, and to have drawn perſecution upon his companions in a thing indifferent, ſaying, That there was nothing in the Scripture that obliged him to it. But *Tertullian* defendeth the action of this ſoldier by Tradition.

When we alledge ſome paſſages of *Tertullian* expreſs againſt invocation of Saints, and againſt Tranſubſtantiation; our Adverſaries on the other ſide, alledge the words of *Hierom* againſt *Helvidius*, 'I have nothing 'more to ſay of *Tertullian*, but that he was not a man 'of the Church:' That is to ſay, he was an Heretick. Whilſt he was Orthodoxal, he condemned Traditions, as it hath formerly appeared unto us. But being turned Montaniſt, he falleth into much admiration of Traditions, vouching the words of our Saviour, *I have yet many things to deliver to you, but you cannot for the preſent bear them away.* Which is the ordinary language of our Adverſaries. Now, it doth not import us, whether he hath written the book of the ſoldiers crown, being an Heretick, or being yet Orthodoxal; ſeeing the Traditions which he bundleth together, touch not the Chriſtian faith. Nevertheleſs, it is certain that he was then an Heretick: For in this book he maliced and repined at the Catholicks, becauſe they taught, that it was lawful for any man to ſave his own life, without expoſing it to martyrdom; and becauſe they rejected the Prophecies of *Montanus*, who ſtiled himſelf the holy Ghoſt. Hereunto thoſe words of *Tertullian* at the ſecond chapter, ſeem to have relation,* 'It remains that they who have rejected the prophe-'cies of the holy Ghoſt, do intend to decline and re-'fuſe martyrdoms.' Alſo, 'I know their Paſtors who 'are Lions in peace, and Harts in battle.' The ſame hath likewiſe been obſerved by *Pamelius*. So then, theſe Gameſters have little reaſon, but leſs honeſty to borrow the weapons of an Heretick.

---

* Plane ſupereſt ut etiam Martyria recuſare meditantur qui prophetias ejuſdem Spiritus ſancti reſpuerunt, &c. Novi & paſtores eorum in pace leones, in prælio cervos.

There

There are found ſome other paſſages of *Tertullian*, wherein by Tradition, he underſtandeth the Doctrine of the Goſpel contained in the holy Scriptures. But we willingly embrace this Tradition.

To this paſſage of *Tertullian*, we may compare another of *Baſil* much alike, in *Chap.* 27. of his book *De Spiritu Sancto*, where he makes a long recapitulation of unwritten Traditions. Hearken to his words: 'Some 'of the precepts and leſſons which the Church obſerveth, and are preached unto us, we have by written 'inſtruction; ſome others we do receive by way of 'myſtery, having been conveyed unto us by the Tradition of the Apoſtles. Both of them have like force 'in matter of piety, and no man that hath inſight (be 'it never ſo little) in the Eccleſiaſtical Laws will contradict it. For if we will reject the unwritten Cuſtoms, 'as having but little vertue, we ſhall endamage the 'Goſpel at unawares, eſpecially in matters that are 'commodious and proper: or rather we ſhall reduce 'preaching to a ſimple and bare name. As for example, (that I may make mention of the firſt and moſt 'common:) What writing hath taught us to mark 'thoſe with the ſign of the Croſs, who have put their 'truſt in the name of Jeſus Chriſt? What Scripture 'hath taught us to turn towards the Eaſt in prayer? 'Which is he of the Saints that hath left unto us by 'writing the words of the invocation, when the Bread 'of the Euchariſt, and Cup of Benediction are ſhewed? 'For we content not ourſelves with that whereof the 'Apoſtle or the Goſpel maketh mention, but we add 'other things before and after, (as having great vertue in the myſtery,) which we were taught by unwritten inſtruction. But by what Scripture do we 'bleſs the water of Baptiſm, and the oil uſed in the 'Unction, eſpecially that wherewith we baptize? Is 'not this a Tacit and myſtical Tradition?' He addeth the triple plunging in Baptiſm, and the renouncing of the devil and his angels. Alſo the cuſtom of ſtanding at prayer the firſt day of the week, and from the *Paſchal* unto *Pentecoſt*, to ſhew that we are raiſed up again with Chriſt, and do ſeek the things that are above;

above; and becauſe ſeven times ſeven days ſignifieth the eternity. (And to make ſhort) he inſerts the belief in God the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, amongſt the Traditions; ſaying, That theſe unwritten things are of ſemblable authority with the written, and match them in virtue, and that the Fathers have covered them with ſilence, as the more high and more venerable, of purpoſe to keep men in more awful obſervance by the obſcurity: And that it is of theſe, as of a moſt ſacred place, wherein only the chief ſacrificing Prieſt did enter.

This paſſage indeed doth ill accord with thoſe excellent ones of *Baſil*, in the which he hath formerly acquainted us, that all which is not of faith is ſin, and that faith is by hearing of the word of God, that whatſoever is without the verge of the Scripture divinely inſpired, is not of faith, and conſequently is ſin; and that to ſhew a forwardneſs in adding to the holy Scripture, is a flat revolt from the faith. By reaſon of this contrariety, *Bellarmin* ſuppoſeth that theſe queſtions, which make a part of his Aſcheticks, were not *Baſil*'s own. * 'For (ſaith he) the Author of theſe 'queſtions ſeems unwilling to admit of unwritten Tra-'ditions. 'But Cardinal *Baronius* affirmeth, that † 'To 'call this into ſuſpicion or doubt, is a notorious ſot-'tiſhneſs. And maintaineth theſe Books to be *Baſil*'s; as it is manifeſted by the ſtile. Saint *Hierom* in his Catalogue, and *Photius* in his Bibliotheca, put the Aſcheticks amongſt the Works of *Baſil*. Yea more, *Gennadius* compoſed Homilies out of pieces of *Baſil*'s Works compacted together, amongſt the which many were taken out of *Aſcheticks*. Wherefore the conjecture of *Eraſmus* is not improbable, who made a preface upon *Baſil*'s book, *de Sanct. Spiritu*. Wherein he profeſſeth, that having tranſlated this book to the half way, he perceived the phraſe to alter, and to be no more of the ſame author; for he could diſ-

* Bellar. de Amiſ. grat. lib. 1. cap. 13. §. *Reſpondeo.*

† Baron. annal. tom. 3. anno 361. § 52. Hoc in dubium revocaſſe ſumma ſtultitia ſit.

cern

cern a palpable other vain. Moreover though *Bellarmin* had ſomething wherewith to defame and diſgrace this piece of *Aſcheticks*, yet could he caſt no aſperſion upon his Treatiſe of the true Faith, where *Baſil* affirmeth that it is a manifeſt revolt from the Faith, and a brand of pride and preſumption, to reject any thing that is written, or to introduce any thing which is not written: *Jeſus Chriſt* having ſaid; *My ſheep hear my voice*; Nor any upon that place, where *Baſil* ſpeaketh to *Euſtachius* the Phyſician, in his 80. Epiſt. * 'If (ſaith he) cuſtom be of force for proof of doctrine, it ſhall be lawful for us in this to imitate them. Let us then ſtick to the arbitration and award of the Scripture inſpired by God, and hold the free ſuffrage and voice of the truth to be on their ſides, whoſe Doctrines ſhall be found concurring with the divine Words.'

Nevertheleſs, let us conſider what benefit our adverſaries can derive from this paſſage, about the which they make ſo much bruit and clamour. In the firſt place, *Baſil* maketh a recital of Traditions, which he affirmeth to be of equal authority with the Scripture; yet amongſt them there are many not approved by the Church of *Rome*, as prayer towards the *Eaſt*, and making conſcience to kneel on the Lord's day, and from the *Paſchal* to *Pentecoſt*. Moſt eſpecially it diſpleaſeth our adverſaries, that *Baſil* in the *Euchariſt*, putteth the conſecration in the prayer or in the invocation (that is to ſay, in ſpeaking to God) and not in the bread. If they believe *Baſil*, why do they reject his Traditions? or if they believe him not, why will they oblige us to believe him?

In the ſecond place, all theſe unwritten Traditions (except the laſt) numbred by the Author of that book,

---

* Εἰ γὰρ ἰσχυρόν ἐστιν εἰς ἀποδειξιν ὀρθότητος ἡ συνήθεια, ἕξει καὶ ἡμῖν πάντως ἀκολουθητὸν ἐκεινοις. Ουκοῦν ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διαιτησάτω γραφὴ, καὶ παρ' οἷς ἂν εὑρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συνοῦσα τοῖς θείοις λόγοις ἐπὶ τούτοις ἕξει πάλιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ ψῆφος.

are

are but ceremonies and laws of Eccleſiaſtical policy, not neceſſary to ſalvation, but ſubject to mutability, and ſuch as conſequently make nothing to the purpoſe. For our diſpute is not of Traditions that concern not the Faith and Chriſtian Doctrine, but of thoſe that concern the doctrine of Salvation, not contained in holy Scripture. Yet I cannot diſſemble, that the author of this book (be he *Baſil*, or whatever he be) is greatly miſtaken in his not only equalling, but alſo preferring (both in height of dignity, and profoundneſs of myſtery) certain petty ceremonies, before the Sacred Doctrine of our redemption, contained in the Goſpel. Can any man without unſufferable injury (not to uſe a more rigid exclamation) equal, yea prefer the Cuſtoms of ſtanding at prayer on certain days, rather than kneeling? Of praying towards the *Eaſt*, rather than towards the *Weſt*? And of giving a benediction to the water or oyl, before the doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God, the benefit of his death, the juſtification by Faith, the election eternal, and the internal Seal of the Spirit of God? Can any man without impiety change any part or particle of theſe doctrines? But as for thoſe ceremonies, they have ſuffered alteration, and the *Romiſh* Church itſelf hath diſparaged and debaſed them. You ſee how prepoſterous and groſs our adverſaries are, who inſtead of covering the faults of thoſe grave *Fathers*, do arm themſelves with their droſs and refuſe, as birds that live on nothing elſe but caterpillers.

And touching the laſt unwritten Tradition, which is, that men ought to believe in God the Father, and in Jeſus Chriſt his Son, and in the Holy Ghoſt; Is it poſſible that *Baſil*, where do ſhine ſo many virtues and perfections, never ſaw this in the Scripture? For Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, at the 14. of Saint *John*, *You believe in God, believe alſo in me.* And in the 5. chap. 23. *To the end that all men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* And as touching the Holy Ghoſt, how oft times is he called God? therefore when the Scripture biddeth to believe in God, it commandeth to believe in the holy Spirit. Now to excuſe

Baſil,

Baſil, we muſt ſay, that he calleth Traditions the doctrines that are not found in the Scripture in expreſs words, but are there in ſubſtance, and in equivalent words. And we do willingly entertain ſuch kind of Traditions. Only he is miſtaken to have entermingled this high and divine Tradition, amongſt Cuſtoms and Ceremonies indifferent in their nature, as things equally neceſſary, and which ought to be regarded with like duty and reverence.

Theſe words of Saint *Hierom*, in an Epiſtle to *Marcella*, are alledged unto us : ‡ *We faſt one term of* 40. *days, at the time that we think meet, according to the Apoſtolical Tradition.* This is but a ceremony, and not a doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith : and we have elſewhere ſhewed, that § ‘ in the ages neareſt approaching to the Apoſtles, the Chriſtian Church faſted but forty hours :’ And that this faſt was arbitrary, and diverſly practiſed.

The ſame *Hierom* againſt the *Luciferians*, makes the Heretick ſpeak thus. ‘ Knoweſt thou not that it is ‘ the cuſtom of the Churches to impoſe hands upon ‘ thoſe who are baptized, and ſo to invoke the holy ‘ Ghoſt ? Doſt thou aſk me where this is written ? I ‘ anſwer, in the Acts of the Apoſtles. And if there ‘ could not be found authority of Scripture for it, the ‘ cuſtom generally obſerved in this point ſhould ſerve ‘ inſtead of a commandment : for many other things ‘ in like manner which are kept in uſe by Tradition in ‘ the Churches, have uſurped the authority of the written Law : as in baptiſm to plunge the head three ‘ times ; and being come forth of the waſhing place, ‘ to taſte the conjunction of milk and honey, for a ſignification of infancy ; not to pray kneeling, nor to ‘ faſt upon our Lord’s day, and throughout the whole ‘ *Quinquageſima* or fifty days : with many other un-

‡ Nos unam quadrageſimam ex Apoſtolica traditione tempore nobis congrue jejunamus.

§ Au livre de la Nouveaté du Paptiſme livre 7. en la 5. Controverſe chap. 6. & 7.

‘ writ-

' written things, which mens indifferent obſervation ' doth challenge to itſelf.' Such is the language of the Heretick, to whom the *Orthodox* anſwereth; ' I ' deny not the Cuſtom of the Churches to be ſo, *&c.*' This paſſage is conſiderable. For I doubt not but the reading of ſuch paſſages maketh our adverſaries ſick at the very heart, ſeeing that the unwritten Traditions whereof the *Fathers* do make mention, as of Traditions deſcended from the Apoſtles, are Traditions which the Church of *Rome* hath rejected: and when the ancient *Fathers* do make recital of thoſe unwritten Traditions, they put not invocation of Saints amongſt them; nor Images of the Trinity; nor ſervice to the Images of Saints; nor the Communion under one kind; nor *Romiſh* Indulgences; nor the forbidding to read the Scripture without ſpecial permiſſion; nor the *Limbus* for the *Fathers*, or that for little infants; nor prayer in an unknown tongue; nor the aſſumption of the Virgin *Mary* bodily into heaven, or her Coronation in the Majeſty of Queen of Heaven; nor Maſſes without Communicants; nor the power of the *Pope* to give and take Kingdoms, and to releaſe ſouls out of Purgatory, &c.

The Reader may note by the way, what little reaſon there is to inſert the cuſtom of ſtanding in prayer (from *Eaſter* to *Whitſuntide*) amongſt the Apoſtolical Traditions, ſeeing that in the 20th Chapter of the *Acts* 36, and at the 21 Chap. 5. the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* prayeth kneeling, between the Paſchal and Pentecoſt, as appeareth by the 6th and 16th Verſes of the 20th Chapter.

As for *Hierom*, his opinion touching theſe ceremonies and external obſervations, is far differing from that of *Baſil* if it be true that *Baſil*, is the Author of that Book *de Sancto Spiritu*. For mark what he ſaith in his 28th Epiſtle to *Lucinius*, ' * I think it expedient briefly to ad-

* Ego te breviter illud admonendum puto, traditiones Eccleſiaſticas (præſertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita obſervandas ut a majoribus tradita ſunt, nec aliorum conſuetudinem, aliorum contrario more ſubverti.

' vertiſe

'vertiſe thee, that Eccleſiaſtical Traditions (eſpecially 'thoſe which offend not the Faith) ought to be obſerved 'according as Men have received them from their An- 'ceſtors. And that the cuſtom of ſome ſhould not be 'ſubverted by the cuſtom of others contrarily practiſed. He will have every man to follow the Cuſtom of his own Church (in matters not contrary to the Faith) without taking in ill part, that other Churches have a contrary cuſtom, which is as much as to ſay, that he accounteth theſe things indifferent in their own nature. And it is the Counſel that Saint *Ambroſe* gave to Saint *Auguſtin*, ſaying, * 'When I am at *Rome*, I faſt on 'Saturday; but when I am here (meaning at *Milan*) 'I do not faſt. So at what Church ſoever thou ſhalt 'arrive, follow the Cuſtom of it, if thou deſireſt not 'to give occaſion of diſlike to any Man, and that 'no man ſhould ſcandalize or be offenſive to thee.

Pope *Gregory* the firſt about the year of our Lord 595, ſending *Auguſtin* the Monk into *England*, (not to plant Chriſtianity there, for that was brought in long before, but to eſtabliſh the Pope's Authothority, to which the Chriſtians of that Iſland were not then ſubject) was aſked ſome Queſtions by the ſaid *Auguſtin*; amongſt the reſt, mark but the third: '† There being but one faith, why are the cuſtom of 'the Churches ſo differing and repugnant? Why is 'there one cuſtom of Maſſes obſerved in the Church 'of *Rome*, and another in that of *France*?' This Pope that undertook not to regulate and ſhape other Churches to the form of his own, anſwereth him, § 'Your

* Auguſt. Epiſt. 118. ad Januarium. Cum Romam venio, jejuno ſabbato, cum hic ſum, non jejuno. Sic etiam tu ad quam forte Eccleſiam veneris, ejus morem ſerva, ſi cuiquam non vis eſſe ſcandalo, nec quemquam tibi.

† *Interrogationes Auguſtini ſub finem operum Gregorii.* Cur cum una ſit fides, ſunt Eccleſiarum conſuetudines tam diverſæ? & altera conſuetudo miſſarum eſt in Rom. Eccleſia, atq; altera in Gallica tenetur?

§ Reſp. Novit, &c. Sed mihi placet ut ſive in Romana, ſive in Gallicanorum, ſeu in qualibet Eccleſia aliquid inveniſti quod plus omnipotenti Deo placere poſſit ſollicite eligas.

'brother

brotherhood knoweth well what is the cuſtom of the Church of *Rome*, wherein you may remember you had your education. But I hold it requiſite and good, if you find any thing either in the Church of *Rome*, or in that of *France*, or in any other, which is more pleaſing to God Almighty, that you make choice of it with all diligence and reſpect.' To celebrate the Maſs at this preſent in *France* otherwiſe than according to the *Romiſh* order, were a flat rebellion: and all that the Pope enjoyneth to the Churches (which he ſubjecteth to himſelf, by the aſſiſtance of Kings and Princes) is granted for inviolable and for an Apoſtolical Tradition.

More eſpecially, our adverſaries do flouriſh inſultingly with the words of *Chryſoſtom*, in his 4. Homily upon the 2. to the *Theſſal.* '* Hence (ſaith he) it appeareth that the Apoſtles have not taught all by Epiſtles, but that they have taught alſo many things without writing, and as well theſe things as thoſe are worthy to be believed,' I have already ſaid that although the intention of *Chryſoſtom* ſhould be to affirm, that the Apoſtles have taught many Doctrines and Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, not contained in holy Scripture, yet would it not follow that theſe were the ſame points which they of the *Romiſh* Church advance and put forward: as invocation of Saints, ſucceſſion of the Pope in the Primacy of St. *Peter*, Images, Indulgences, *&c.* But *Chryſoſtom* ſuffereth us not to doubt of his intention. He underſtandeth only the things that are not neceſſary to ſalvation: for as touching the Doctrines that are neceſſary to ſalvation, he affirmeth in the precedent Homily (being the third,) that they are all contained clearly in the Scripture. Ob-

* Ἐνταῦθεν δῆλον ὅτι οὐ πάντα δι' ἐπιστολῆς παρέδοσαν, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ κὴ ἀγραφως. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῦτα ἐστιν ἀξιόπιστα.

ſerve his words: ‘ ‡ All that is in the divine Scriptures, ‘ is clear and legal: all things that are neceſſary, are ‘ therein plainly couched.’ Nothing can be uttered more expreſly.

The ſame Father in his third Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, ſpeaketh of the commemoration of the dead in the Euchariſt in theſe words: ‘ It is ‘ not without reaſon that he hath ordained by the Apoſ‘tles, that in the reverend myſteries a commemorati‘on be made of the dead, acknowledging that there‘by much gain and good accrueth to them.’ But we muſt take notice, that the prayer which the ancient Church did make for the dead, is rejected by the *Romiſh* Church of this time. For the Church of *Rome* prayeth only for the ſouls of Purgatory, to the end their torment may be aſſwaged, or conſummated. But the antient Church, prayed for the Prophets, Apoſtles, and Martyrs; and humbly beſought that thoſe for whom it petitioned, ſhould be raiſed to ſalvation, or ſhould riſe earlier and at a better hour than the reſt, or ſhould be more ſuperficially finged with the fire of the laſt judgment. Particularly, *Chryſoſtom* was of opinion that the Souls could not be tormented without the bodies, as he ſpeaketh in his 39. Homily upon the 1. to the *Corinthians*. And in the ſame paſſage, where his 3. Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Philippians* is objected to us, he ſuppoſeth that the dead which are comforted by lamentations and prayers, are not the faithful, but the infidels. So as this paſſage maketh altogether againſt the Church of *Rome*.

Though Saint *Auguſtin* be punctual and excellent in this ſubject, (as we have ſeen) yet they would make him an advocate to plead for unwritten Traditions in matter concerning the faith. This holy Father hath believed, and we with him, that the neceſſary Doctrines which concern faith and manners, are ſufficiently contained in the holy Scriptures: And for ſome certain

‡ Πάντα σαφῆ καὶ ἐυθία τὰ παρὰ ταῖς γραφαῖς, πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα.

Cuſtoms,

Cuſtoms, Ceremonies and outward obſervations, becauſe they are generally received, he believeth they are derived from ancient unwritten Tradition. It becometh none to gainſay this, but franticks, or ſuch as are given to a contradicting humour, and are enemies to the peace. Good reaſon for it. To give you ſome inſtance; '* It is not commanded in the Scripture to 'celebrate annually the day of our Saviour's Nativi-'ty, nor of the Paſchal, nor of the Lord's Reſurrec-'tion, nor of *Pentecoſt*,' which is the day whereon the holy Ghoſt deſcended upon the Apoſtles. For Saint *Auguſtin* in his 118. Epiſtle, bringeth theſe examples, where he ſaith, 'To ſtir up diſſentions hereupon, for 'matters in their own nature not neceſſary to ſalvati-'on, but authorized by the general cuſtom of ſo ma-'ny ages, ſhould be (according to my judgment) and 'according to the truth, a deſpightful perverſeneſs, 'yea, a ſymptom of diſtraction, confounding all con-'cord and quietneſs.' In like manner doth the Scripture give no charge, touching the preciſe hour of adminiſtring the holy Supper. Jeſus Chriſt occaſionally performed it after Supper, to place and ſubſtitute the holy Euchariſt immediately to the Paſchal Lamb. But it appeareth by the hiſtory of the *Acts*, that the Apoſtles were not obliged to this hour; and ſince that time the general Cuſtom was to celebrate it in the morning. I ſay, for a man hereupon to ſeparate himſelf from the Communion of the Church, and to make a ſchiſm, or trouble the peace of the Church, in a matter that concerneth not the Doctrine of faith, nor is neceſſary to Salvation; what is it but ſtubborn arrogance? It is moſt neceſſary not to moleſt the

* *Aug. ad Januar. Epiſt.* 118. Illa quæ non ſcripta, ſed tradita cuſtodimus, quæ quidem toto terrarum orbe ſervantur, dantur intelligi vel ab ipſis Apoſtolis, vel plenariis Conciliis, quorum eſt in Eccleſia ſaluberrima authoritas commendata atque ſtatuta retineri. Sicut quod Domini paſſio, et reſurrectio, & aſcenſio in cœlum, et adventus de cœlo Spiritus Sancti anniverſaria ſolemnitate celebratur.

Church, for matters not neceſſary in their own nature. If the miſchief be not great for as much as concerneth the Doctrine, yet it is of no ſmall importance for what concerneth the manners, and the many inconveniencies that inſue thereon. This is the ſame that Saint *Auguſtin* teacheth in his 118th Epiſtle to *Januarius*, where he argueth the caſe, whether they be well adviſed who appoint, that on Thurſday before the Paſchal, the holy Supper be twice ſolemnized, that is to ſay, in the morning and after evening repaſt. His anſwer is, ' * If the authority of the ' holy Scripture, preſcribe what is to be done, we ' are not to doubt but that we ought to do as we ' read, &c. as alſo if there be any thing that the ' univerſal Church doth practiſe throughout the ' world. For to diſpute whether this ſhould be done ' or no, is a meer lunacy.' But in other matters (as that concerning the hour of the holy Supper) which do vary according to the places, he alloweth that every man ſhould follow the cuſtom of his country.

He ſpeaketh of the ſame other where. As in the ſecond book of Baptiſm againſt the *Donatiſts* the ſeventh Chapter. ' † Which Cuſtom (not to rebap' tize Hereticks) I believe to be derived from Apo' ſtolical Tradition, as many things are not found ' written in their Books, nor the Councils of poſte' rity after them. Nevertheleſs, becauſe they are kept ' by the Catholick Church, it is believed that they were ' delivered by none but them.' And in his fourth Book Chap. 24. ' *‡ That which the univerſal Church doth

---

* Quid horum ſit faciendum, ſi divinæ Scripturæ præſcribit authoritas, non ſit dubitandum quin ita facere debeamus ut legimus, &c. Similiter etiam ſi quid horum totam per orbem frequentat Eccleſia. Nam hoc quin ita faciendum ſit diſputare, inſolentiſſima inſania eſt.

† Quam conſuetudinem credo ex Apoſtolica traditione venientem, ſicut multa non inveniuntur in literis eorum, neque in Conciliis poſteriorum. Et tamen quia per univerſam cuſtodiuntur Eccleſiam, non niſi ab ipſis tradita & commendata creduntur.

*‡ Quod univerſa tenet Eccleſia, nec Conciliis inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum eſt, non niſi auctoritate Apoſtolica inſtitutum rectiſſimé creditur.

' keep,

'keep and hath not been inſtituted by Councils, but 'hath always been preſerved, is juſtly believed to have 'been given for no other Tradition but Apoſtolical.' And in his fifth Book, Chap. 23. '‡ The Apoſtles 'have commanded nothing to that purpoſe, (ſpeaking 'of the re-baptizing of Hereticks) but we muſt be-'lieve that the other Cuſtom which was oppoſed 'againſt *Cyprian*, took beginning from their Tradi-'tion. As there are many Things which the uni-'verſal Church obſerveth, and therefore are believed 'to be inſtituted by the Apoſtles, although they ap-'pear not in writing.'

In this Tract he ſpeaketh concerning the Cuſtom of not re-baptizing thoſe, who have been baptized by Hereticks, which is no point neceſſary to Salvation. For how many men are ſaved, that never heard diſcourſe of this queſtion? If a man once baptized, be re-baptized the ſecond time, although his ſecond Baptiſm be ſuperfluous, yet nevertheleſs the fault not being in him that is re-baptized, he ſhall not be therefore debarred from Salvation. Or, if the bap-tiſm of Hereticks be unlawful, yet he that is convert-ed from hereſy to the true faith having received no other Baptiſm, ſhall not be deprived of Salvation, be-cauſe it happeneth not by his default. It is not the privation, but the neglect and contempt of Baptiſm, that impeacheth Man's Salvation. Saint *Cyprian* and his Predeceſſor *Agrippine*, and with them all the Bi-ſhops of *Africk*, have in this point been of a contra-ry opinion to the *Romiſh* Church: and by expreſs Councils have condemned the Doctrine held in that Church. Would our Adverſaries therefore exclude Saint *Cyprian* and his Companions from Salvation? Or do they believe that he failed in ſomething ne-

‡ Apoſtoli quidem nihil exinde præceperunt, ſed conſuetudo alia, quæ opponebatur Cypriano, ab eorum traditione exordium ſumpſiſſe credenda eſt. Sicut ſunt multa quæ univerſa tenet Ecclesia, et ab hoc ob Apoſtolis præcepta bene creduntur quamquam ſcripta non reperiantur.

cessary to Salvation? Indeed Saint *Augustin* in the same Chapter of his second book against the *Donatists* affirmeth, that ‘ ‖ this question of Baptism was ‘ not yet well discussed and explained in Saint *Cyprians* ‘ time.’ But it is not credible that the Christian Church at that time, should be unresolved upon any point necessary to Salvation.

* This is above all to be considered, that Saint *Augustin* himself (who telleth us that the Apostles wrote nothing as touching this matter, and that this Custom cometh by Tradition) doth not stick to handle this Question by the Scriptures, and bringeth many passages from thence, which he affirmeth to be certain, and the proofs to be clear. Whence it appeareth, that by the *things unwritten*, he understandeth matters which are not in express terms in the Scripture, but are deduced from thence by good consequence.

These things serve for the clearing of a passage in the same Father, at Chap. 33. of his first book against *Cresconius*, where speaking of the re-baptization of Hereticks, he hath it thus; ‘ Although there be no ‘ certain example vouched for this out of the Scrip‘ tures, yet herein we preserve the authority of the ‘ sacred word, when we do that which pleaseth the ‘ Church universal.’ For he speaketh of a point not necessary to Salvation, and of a Custom, but not of a Doctrine of faith. The which Custom nevertheless he groundeth upon the Scripture.

The same answers may serve, to resolve all other passages produced out of the Ancients. For by these Traditions, whether they understand the holy Scriptures themselves, and the Doctrine of the Gospel; or whether they understand Doctrines not contained in the Scriptures in express terms, but drawn from

---

‖ Nondum erat diligenter illa baptismi quæstio pertractata.

* *Aug. lib.* 1. *de Baptismo contra Donatistas.* Jam ne videar humanis argumentis id agere, &c. ex Evangelio profero certa documenta. Vide et lib. 2. ca. 14. Et lib. 4. ca. 7. Et lib. 5 ca. 4. et 23. Scripturarum sanctis testimoniis non solum colligitur, sed planè ostenditur.

thence

thence by consequence; or that they understand Customs, Ceremonies, and Laws of Ecclesiastical policy allowed by the universal Church; we willingly embrace all these Traditions. For though we place this last sort of Traditions far below the two first, yet no Ceremony can be brought unto us, nor Law of Ecclesiastical policy, which hath been generally received by the universal Church of the first ages, but we also do approve of them.

CHAP. XXVI. *Three antient Customs which we are blamed to have forsaken.*

THERE are three Customs, and ancient observations, which are cast upon us for a reproach, that we have left them; that is to say, the sign of the Cross in the forehead; prayer for the dead, and Lent. Our answer is, that these are Customs which have not always been, and which the Apostles have not observed; and lastly, which were diversly practised in divers Churches, and in divers ages: So as if we were to chuse what age, and what Church we ought to adhere unto, we should find ourselves much puzzled. The best is, the Church of *Rome* hath changed these Customs, and under a shadow of keeping the words, hath wholly perverted the thing itself; having turned '† the sign of the Cross, (which was but a mark of 'the Christian Profession) into superstition and idola-'try,' into conjuration, preservatives, and spells, to repulse the Devil's temptations, not only of men, but of Jesus Christ: For, 'In the Mass they make signs 'of the Cross by a prescribed number not only upon 'the bread not consecrated, but also upon the conse-'crated Host, for fear lest the assaults of the Devil

† Augustin. de Verb. Domini Serm 8. Ne de cruce Christi erubescat, in frontem illam figat, ubi sedes pudoris.

‡ *Efficit super ea crucis signaculum, ut per crucis virtutem omnes comitatus diabolicæ malignitatis effugiat, ne contra Sacerdotem vel sacrificium aliquo modo prevaleat.* Il adjouste que l'encens sert aussi à chasser les diables.

' ſhould prevail againſt it,' as Pope *Innocent* the third doth teach, in his 2d book of the myſteries of the Maſs, Chap. 58.

It is the ſame concerning prayer for the Dead, whereof the firſt mention is found to be ſome two hundred years after the birth of our Saviour: which was made for the Saints, Apoſtles, Prophets, Martyrs, and for the faithful, to the end they might be raiſed at a better Hour than the reſt, or be the more lightly ſcalded with the fire of the laſt judgment, and after ſome refreſhment in the ſleep of peace, they might riſe joyful to everlaſting Salvation. But the Pope hath changed theſe into prayers for tormented Souls in Purgatory, taking this occaſion to eclipſe the perfection of the benefit of Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe blood purgeth us from all ſin, 1 *John* 7. and ſo to make a trade and traffick, whereby to heap up riches innumerable.

The ſame abuſe is crept into Lent, which the Pope maketh uſe of, to advance his Empire, uſurping thereby the power to moderate the Bellies, Kitchens, Markets, and Tables; to give Diſpenſations, and to change faſting into a difference of Meats, and an exerciſe of humility in matter of merit and of ſatisfaction, as well for him that faſteth, as for another. And whereas heretofore this abſtinence was free, and every Men did faſt before the Paſchal as many Days as he thought good, and that theſe Reglements were made by ordinances of the Biſhops in every Church; the Pope hath thereto impoſed a preciſe neceſſity, unleſs a Diſpenſation be obtained from him, or his Miniſters. And laſtly, he hath drawn to himſelf a power that he had not formerly, but only in the Biſhoprick of Rome, which was a particular Church.

This is our belief; that the things neceſſary to Salvation ought not to be aboliſhed, by reaſon of the abuſes which are, and may be thruſt into them, but we muſt take away the abuſe, and return to the fountain, which is the Word of God. But as for things not neceſſary, nor perpetual, nor obſerved from the Beginning, and without which the Chriſtian

Chriſtian Faith may ſubſiſt in its integrity; when Corruption is infuſed amongſt them; and the uſe is transformed into abuſe and idolatry, or tyranny, or ſuperſtition; it is prudently done to ſhave off the occaſions of abuſe, and firmly to ſhut this gate againſt the Devil.

CHAP. XXVII. *That the Traditions of the* Romiſh *Church of this time, have nothing in common with the unwritten Traditions mentioned by the Fathers.*

IT appeareth how weak, and how little to the purpoſe all is, which our Adverſaries do produce in the behalf of the Antiquity of their Traditions. For the unwritten traditions which they have recited, are not Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith that add any thing to the Doctrine of Salvation contained in the Scriptures, as I have proved: but Cuſtoms, and Ceremonies, and obſervations of Eccleſiaſtical policy. Now, the Traditions of our Adverſaries are of another nature. They put foremoſt the Pope's Succeſſion in the Apoſtleſhip and Supremacy of Saint *Peter* over the univerſal Church, upon which Tradition they make all Religion to depend. Yea, they maintain that the Church is founded not only upon Saint *Peter*, but alſo upon the Popes that are his pretended Succeſſors.

They ſtuff our ears with Invocation of Saints, with religious ſervice to Images, and with adoration of Reliques, which are Traditions that ſhake and totter the ſervice and Religious Adoration due to God alone, and do eſtabliſh articles of the Chriſtian Faith, to wit, that the Saints do know our hearts, and that we muſt employ them for mediators, and that they can hear our prayers effectually.

So likewiſe doth the Church of *Rome* tell us, of ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of the Saints, which the Pope gathereth into the Treaſure of the Church, and diſtributeth them amongſt others by his Indulgences. This Tradition uſhereth in three new Articles of Faith. The firſt is, that man by his puniſhments and afflictions, can ſatisfy God more than his ſins do merit. The ſecond

cond is, that God receiveth the ſatisfactions of another, for Payment of our ſins. The third is, that God hath eſtabliſh'd the Pope, to be diſtributor of the ſatisfactions of another, and commandeth him to gather them together into the treaſure of the Church. What is all this but a new Goſpel? Certainly if theſe Traditions be true, the holy Scripture is a book very imperfect in the principal materials of the Chriſtian Faith. For what is there more important then the remiſſion of Sins?

Alſo the Tradition of Monaſtick Vows layeth down this Doctrine, (which is a new Article of Faith,) to wit, that man can perform works of Supererrogation, that is to ſay, more good works, and more perfect than thoſe which God hath commanded in his Word.

I ſay as much of the Communion under one kind, wherein is impleaded the abridgment of the moiety of the Sacrament inſtituted by the Son of God. Not to ſpeak of ſo many other Traditions, which are not only additions to the Scripture, but meerly diametrical contradictions to it.

This alſo is worthy of conſideration, that when the Fathers do rehearſe ſome examples of unwritten Traditions, they do not mention thoſe of the Romiſh Church at this time, but others that the Church of Rome hath diſeſteemed, and obſerveth not: As prayer towards the Eaſt; The prohibition of faſting on the Lord's day; The cuſtom to pray ſtanding on the ſame day, and from the Paſchal to Pentecoſt; The cuſtom of taſting the milk and honey after Baptiſm, and not to be waſhed ſeven days after; The prayer for the deceaſed Saints, to the end they may be raiſed at a happier hour, and in their ſleep of reſt they may find refreſhment, with ſuch like matters which the Church of Rome hath pretermitted, (becauſe they ſerved not the Popes turn) and hath invented others, that are more gainful, and better accommodated to the profit and exaltation of the Pope, and all the Roman Clergy.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII. *Of the multitude of Traditions in the Church of Rome.*

THE ſaying of * *Cornelius Tacitus* is very true, that the worſt and moſt corrupted Republiques are thoſe, which have moſt laws. For in the ſame proportion that vices wax ſtrong, the laws alſo are multiplied, eſpecially when the Laws themſelves became vices, and miſchiefs are applyed for remedies.

If this be true in human affairs, much more in divine, and in the Doctrine of ſalvation. It is certain that in civil affairs poſterity inſtructed by experience, hath often redreſſed the occurrences, changing them into better, and hath cured old evils with new laws. But as for the Doctrine of ſalvation delivered by God himſelf, this will admit of no alteration without infinite impiety. It is not for Subjects to add to the laws of their Sovereign, nor for Men to preſume to be wiſer than God.

It will be found that all the Traditions which men have added to the Scripture, are ſo many infringements of the Law of God, which under the colour of adding thereunto, do overturn that which God hath eſtabliſhed; and are ſo many artificial means, through a glorious pomp, to dazzle the eyes of the People, and to amuſe them, whilſt they are ſeduced; and laſtly to enrich and exalt the Clergy. For the Prelates of the Church of Rome earneſtly bent to their profit, have taken ſufficient notice, that the Goſpel in its ſimplicity could not ſerve to build up their Empire.

And although this numberleſs rhapſody of Traditions ſhould not be woven by a fraudulent workmanſhip, yet the confounding multitude of new ordinances ſmothereth the old, and cauſeth that things neceſſary cannot be diſcerned from ſuperfluous, and that Jeſus Chriſt is ſcarce known among the Saints: And the abſurdity of many new inventions by their addition, do call the antient Doctrines into ſuſpicion, and weaken

* Ann lib. 3. In corruptiſſima republica plurimæ leges.

their

their certainty. Eſpecially when they make the true knowledge of divine doctrine, to depend upon the authority of human Tradition, and God to be believed, becauſe men have ſo ordained it, as it is now practiſed in the Church of Rome.

Add to this the inclination of man to worſhip his own proper inventions, and to till and improve that moſt induſtriouſly, which he himſelf hath planted. For as the earth nouriſheth nettles which herſelf hath produced, much better than good plants that are ſtrange and brought from far; ſo the ſpirit of man is reſtleſs in taking care, that the laws be obſerved which he of himſelf hath invented, much more than thoſe which Jeſus Chriſt hath brought from heaven; eſpecially when theſe new Doctrines are gainful to the projectors, and a prop to their dominion. Hence it cometh to paſs, that in the Church of Rome, the doctrine of the Goſpel (which conſiſteth of rules few and eaſy) is a claſped book to the people, and the commandments of God are of little moment; but the Traditions (though toilſome, and almoſt innumerable) are moſt religiouſly obſerved, and with marvellous obedience.

Amongſt all the Religions that ever were in the world, the Romiſh in multitude of Laws and Traditions beareth the Bell away, the number of them being ſo great, as ſcarce an age will ſuffice to learn them. And it had been very requiſite, that when the Council of Trent did eſtabliſh Commiſſaries to attend the cenſure of prohibited books, it ſhould have eſtabliſhed other Officers immediately, to collect together the unwritten Traditions, and to put them in order; for ſeeing that by the authority of this Council, the Romiſh Traditions were declared, to be of equal authority with the Scripture, it was convenient that theſe Traditions being digeſted into a body, ſhould have been annexed to the Scripture, to the end to have the body of Chriſtian Religion entirely together. But they gave their minds to be neglectful in this point, for fear of affrighting the people with many myriads of Traditions, of prodigious length: As alſo leſt the people

people ſhould compare the vanity of theſe Traditions with the ſanctity and excellence of the holy Scriptures, which our Adverſaries hinder to be read, with all their might and diligence. Moreover, our Adverſaries do ſay, that the Pope and the Church of Rome can add to the Creed, and eſtabliſh new Articles of faith. Whereupon it followeth, that if Chriſtian Religion may ſuffer yet more additions to be in matters eſſential, the Fathers did vainly labour to make a perfect body of the Chriſtian Religion, ſeeing that it is as yet imperfect.

I (being moved with theſe conſiderations, which do altogether hinder them) did deſign with myſelf, to make a collection of all the Traditions of the Church of Rome, and to lend help to their negligence. But being entred thereinto, I perceived the labour to be endleſs, and was overwhelmed with the multitude. It hath happened to me, as to thoſe that ſettle themſelves in an evening to count the firſt ſtars that appear, and whilſt they are counting the firſt, others appear, and then more, ſo as all their reckoning is interrupted. Thus labour increaſing underhand, dulleth the edge of a man's deſire, and ſo much the rather, ſeeing there is no man but is ſoon weary of gathering uſeleſs droſs together.

If I were diſpoſed to make a perfect Catalogue of the Romiſh Traditions, it would be neceſſary for me to decypher, and paint forth the infinite diverſity of Maſſes; the ſervices and ſuffrages of the dead; the Rubriques and Proviſo's to ſupply the defects of the Maſs, ariſing either from ſome defect in the perſon of him that celebrateth, or from the place, or from the time, or from ſomething in the matter, or in the intention.

It would be needful for me to inſert all the laws touching the Adminiſtration of the ſeven Sacraments, and the diſciplines of the Romiſh Pontificality, that direct the collation of the ſeven Orders. The Conſecration of the Biſhops, the Archiepiſcopal garment, the benediction of Abbots, Abbeſſes, and Nuns; the De-

Dedication of the Churches, the Consecration of the Altars, whether fixed or portative; together with the vessel and moveables of the Church and Church-yards: the reconciliation of the Churches and Church-yards, in case of pollution, by effusion of blood, or by other dishoneſt act, or by the interrment of an Heretick: the benediction of the Images, Crosses, Corporals, Relicks, Bells, and Standards: the Consecration of the Chrysme, and the Fonts; the Admonitions, Excommunications, and Reconcilements of Penitents on Maundy Thursday: the form of Degradings and Exorcisms, the single and double shaving, the infinite variety of Monks and their Orders, and of the divers priviledges and spiritual graces, which the Pope hath granted unto them.

It would likewise be needful for me, to represent the laws of the book of holy Ceremonies, wherein the form of the Pope's Obsequies and Funerals, and of the Election and Coronation of a new one is prescribed. The submissions which the Kings owe in the Procession that is made at their Coronation, and at the Feast. The Coronation of the Emperor by the hand of the Pope, with his shameful homages and submissions to his Holiness. The benediction of the Knights of the Church. The benediction of the Rose on our Lord's day *Lætare*, and of the sword on Christmas night. The Consecration of the *Agnus Dei*. The Creation of Cardinals. The power of Apostolick Legates. The Order of the Consistory, and of the Conclave, and of the Council when the Pope is resident there in person, or by his *Nuntio's*. The Papal Mass, and how the Pope receiveth the Communion. The Pope's Habits, his Episcopal Mitre, his Royal Crown, and a thousand the like things, whereof the very names do terrify us, and the Laws and Disciplines, for quantity, do surpass the Bible in thickness.

It would have been needful, to add a thousand villanous and ignominious precepts, touching busy and unchaste interrogations which the Confessors make, and the determinations touching the cases of conscience. But modesty hath not permitted it, and I was loath to stain

ſtain my book with ſuch infamous rules, which teach vices under the ſhadow of examining and reprehending them.

Therefore to put ſome bounds to this trouble, I have contented my ſelf to bring traditions which concern the Doctrine, that is to ſay, which in ſome ſort thruſt at the Law of God, and the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and that concern the Sacraments, and the Orders, and the Eccleſiaſtical charges, with ſome ſuperſtitions where the abuſe is moſt groſs and apparent.

I have drawn all theſe Traditions from the publick practice, from the Councils approved by the Popes, from the Text of the Maſs itſelf, and from the Decrees, Decretals, and Extravagants of the Popes. And from ſome of the more famous Authors, as *Lombard* and *Thomas*, two Princes of the School, *Bellarmin*, *Vaſquez*, *Gregory* of Valence, *Tolet*, *Emanuel Sa*, that are Jeſuits, *Navarre* the Popes Penitentiary; the three latter I quote moſt often, becauſe they maintain their ſayings by a multitude of other Doctors; ſo as under the name of one Author, I alledge many.

All ſuch as have hearts diſpoſed to learn, ſhall here ſee with admiration, mixed with grief, (as in a ſmall contracted table) the whole maſſy body of Papiſm, varied with a hundred thouſand colours, and ſhall be able thereby to profit. For the ſimple recital is enough for refutation, and to lead forth into view the myſtery of iniquity.

F I N I S.

11 FE 69